63 Periodicals
Royal

WITHDRAWN

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
LIBRARY

23 JUL 1979

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

The Society, AS A BODY, *is not responsible for the opinions advanced in the following pages.*

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Fourth Series

VOLUME XXI

LONDON
OFFICES OF THE SOCIETY
96 CHEYNE WALK, S.W.10
1939

Made and Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome and London

CONTENTS

PAGE

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: THE HISTORICAL BEARING OF PLACE-NAME STUDIES; ENGLAND IN THE SIXTH CENTURY. By Professor F. M. Stenton, *M.A.*, *D.Litt.*, *F.B.A.* . 1

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH MEDIEVAL SCHOLARSHIP BETWEEN 1660 AND 1730. By Professor David C. Douglas, *M.A.*, *F.R.Hist.S.* 21

THE IDEA OF A MERCANTILE STATE. By A. V. Judges, *B.A.*, *F.R.Hist.S.* 41

ENGLISH AND ČECH INFLUENCES ON THE HUSITE MOVEMENT. By Professor R. R. Betts, *B.A.*, *F.R.Hist.S.* . . 71

THE LAST YEARS OF THE COURT OF STAR CHAMBER, 1630–41. (*The Alexander Prize Essay.*) By Henry E. I. Phillips, *B.A.* 103

FOX'S MARTYRS; THE GENERAL ELECTION OF 1784. By Mrs. Eric George, *M.A.*, *Litt.D.*, *F.R.Hist.S.* . . 133

INDEX 169

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL 181

LIST OF FELLOWS 202

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS 238

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Delivered 10 *February*, 1938

By Professor F. M. Stenton, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A.

The Historical Bearing of Place-Name Studies; England in the Sixth Century

During the last twenty years, the study of English place-names has placed a large body of new evidence at the service of those who are interested in the earliest phases of Anglo-Saxon history.[1] It may at once be admitted that the study has sometimes shown its vitality by becoming controversial, and that much of the evidence may be interpreted in more than one way. It is gradually becoming clear that when all the available material has been collected and discussed, there will remain a very large number of place-names of which no conclusive interpretation is ever likely to be given. It will be many years before the place-

[1] My object in this address is to indicate some historical conclusions which are suggested by the results of recent work on the interpretation of English place-names. I have not attempted to produce original solutions of hard questions, and I have drawn unreservedly on the published work of others. Most of the material which I have used will be found in the volumes of the Survey of English Place-Names, and in the various books and articles through which Professor Ekwall has thrown new light on innumerable branches of place-name study. Sir Allen Mawer very kindly read the address while it was still in typescript, but I must take full responsibility for its contents, and in particular for the historical opinions which are expressed in it.

names of all England have been traced backwards with a full apparatus of reference from the present day to the moment of their first recorded appearance. Nevertheless, enough has already been done to foreshadow the nature of the contribution which these studies are likely to make towards the solution of historical problems. It has been suggested that I might take this opportunity of indicating some of the points at which the investigation of place-names impinges on history. It is obvious that a short address which ranged over the whole field of place-name study would be a disjointed affair, and very likely to represent the historical conclusions suggested by this research as much more definite than they really are. This evening, I propose to confine myself to the century in which it was decided that the Anglo-Saxon peoples should be dominant in southern Britain. And within this period, I wish to concentrate on the central problem of its history —the problem of the extent to which the British population survived the catastrophe of the Anglo-Saxon conquest.

There have been eminent historians to whom this question has presented little difficulty. In 1867, for example, Freeman wrote that " though the literal extirpation of a nation is an impossibility, there is every reason to believe that the Celtic inhabitants of those parts of Britain which had become English at the end of the sixth century had been as nearly extirpated as a nation can be." [1] Freeman was prepared to admit that a large number of British women must have been spared by the invaders, and that for the male population of Britain, slavery was a possible alternative to death or emigration.[2] Nevertheless, he

[1] *The History of the Norman Conquest of England*, I, 18.

[2] In much that has been written on this period by others besides Freeman, it is implied that although the greater part of the male population of Britain may have been killed or driven into exile, large numbers of British women survived the Anglo-Saxon conquest. This contrast is not borne out by the character of the British personal names taken into use by the descendants of the first English settlers. The number of British masculine names thus employed, though small, is not insignificant (Förster,

reiterated his conclusion that "in Britain, so far as such a process is possible, the intruding nation altogether supplanted the elder nation," and his opinion, thus emphatically expressed, has had great influence on the way in which the earliest English history has been envisaged by later writers and teachers. On the other hand, like all dogmatic judgments of the kind, it invited contradiction. From time to time, during the last sixty years, every fragment of what can be construed as evidence has been tested for its bearing on the question of British survival, and much that is not evidence at all has sometimes been brought into the discussion. It can hardly be said that this labour has led to any general conclusion which is at once clear-cut and convincing. The statement of Sir Paul Vinogradoff that "the settlement of Saxons, Angles, Jutes, and Frisians in Great Britain modified considerably the history of this country" [1] shows the extent to which the best opinion of the last generation had moved away from Freeman's position. But it fails to leave a clear impression on the mind, and the facts by which it is supported in its context are, to say the least, inconclusive. Since 1904, when this sentence was written, the evidence collected by archæologists and by students of English place-names has made the discussion more realistic. The historical significance of these studies can easily be over-emphasised. But they have at least shown that neither Freeman's conception of a British people "altogether supplanted" by their Anglo-Saxon conquerors, nor Vinogradoff's conception of the Anglo-Saxon settlement as a mere factor in the continuous history of Britain is likely to prevail in the last synthesis.

The work of identifying and explaining the British

"Keltisches Wortgut im Englischen" in *Festgabe für Felix Liebermann*, pp. 174 *et seqq.*; Smith, *Place-Names of the North Riding of Yorkshire*, p. xvi). But it may be doubted whether there is any clear example of a British feminine name which passed at an early date into the general body of English personal nomenclature.

[1] *The Growth of the Manor*, p. 117.

element in English local nomenclature is beset with every kind of difficulty. Only a small minority of English place-names are recorded in writings earlier than the Norman Conquest, and although it is generally possible to infer the original form of a name from an adequate number of Middle English spellings, there is an embarrassing number of cases in regard to which attack along these lines breaks down. It is sometimes very hard to tell whether an ancient place-name which has no obvious meaning is a worn-down fragment of British speech, or a compound of one of the many words once common to all the North Sea peoples of which there is no independent record in written English. Even when the British origin of a name is reasonably certain, it is often hard to determine its precise meaning, or to reconstruct the history of the sound-changes which lie behind its first recorded form. Apart from the names of places and persons, there is hardly any direct and contemporary evidence for the content of the ancient British vocabulary. It is obviously dangerous to proceed on the general assumption that words first recorded in medieval Welsh bore the same meaning, or even existed, in Roman Britain, and although many suggestive analogies have been drawn from the Celtic languages of Gaul and Ireland, they do not often provide a conclusive explanation of a difficult British name. It is essentially the meagreness of the recorded British vocabulary which has prevented scholars from reaching any definite conclusion about the most famous of all these names—the Romano-British *Londinium*. According to the most plausible explanation which it has yet received, it was derived from a British personal name *Londinos*. The name is not recorded, but in structure it would be a natural formation from an adjective *londos*, which itself does not occur in any British language, but is known to have existed in Irish, with the meaning "wild" or "savage." It is probably safe to assume that it was current also in Britain, and if so, like other words carrying a suggestion of feral qualities, it may have become the basis

of a personal name. In spite of the hypothetical stages in this sequence, it may perhaps come fairly close to the facts of the case. But it is at best an artificial reconstruction of an unrecorded development, and as Henry Bradley observed thirty years ago, " as no such name as Londinos has yet been found borne by any Briton or Gaul, the theory of personal derivation remains uncertain." [1]

It has often been suggested that a considerable number of place-names which seem to be of English origin may really represent British names distorted or rationalised by the Anglo-Saxon settlers who adopted them. Every student of place-names is alive to this possibility. But the history of the British names which are known to have been taken over by English settlers suggests that it is less formidable than is often believed. It is true that by a process of folk-etymology the final syllable of a British name may be given a purely English appearance.[2] Englishmen were sometimes confronted in a British place-name by sounds which had no equivalent in their own language, and to which only a rough approximation could be made. But the facts which can be recovered about the adoption of British names by English settlers are strongly opposed to the view that these names were often deliberately or instinctively re-shaped in order that they might become intelligible. The forms in which British place-names passed into English speech varied in accordance with local conditions of which nothing can now be known. In some cases, only the first syllable of a British name survived adoption ; in others, a long compound was taken over as

[1] *Collected Papers of Henry Bradley*, p. 90. The paper entitled " English Place-Names " from which this quotation is taken was first published in 1910 in *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, Vol. I. It contains a discussion of ancient British place-names which is of permanent importance, and in the width of its range over the whole field of place-name study, it forms what is in effect a preface to the intensive work carried out by other hands in the following years.

[2] As in the Old English *Eoforwic* from the Romano-British *Eburacum* through an intermediate British form such as *Evuroc*. See Bradley, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

a whole.[1] What is most remarkable about the transmission of these names is not the mutilation of some and the imperfect reproduction of others, but the fact that many are preserved with sufficient accuracy to serve as evidence of the sound-developments which had taken place in the British language by the time of the Anglo-Saxon invasion.

Moreover, the view that many British place-names may have survived in an English guise cannot easily be reconciled with the complete disappearance of most of the names which are mentioned in documents relating to Roman Britain. That the names of military stations in the North should have disappeared with few exceptions is not surprising. These stations were abandoned long before the first Anglo-Saxon settlements had been made. It is much more remarkable that within the eastern half of lowland Britain, within which the names of many civilian settlements are recorded by Roman writers, all but a small minority have completely passed away. Along the course of Watling Street, *Verolamium* is the only Romano-British name which survived, even in part, between London and north Warwickshire.[2] Along the Fosse Way between Lincoln and High Cross in Leicestershire, there has survived no trace of the names *Crococalanum*, *Margidunum*, or *Vernemetum*; and although a Celtic river-name [3] probably lies behind the Old English *Ligora ceaster* which has become Leicester, it is a new formation, uninfluenced by any memory of the Romano-British *Ratae*. Along the road

[1] Thus the Romano-British *Durnovaria*, now Dorchester, Dorset, appears as *Dornwaraceaster* in the ninth century. The contracted form *Dornaceaster* which has produced the modern Dorchester first appears in 937. For the detailed history of the name see Fägersten, *Place-Names of Dorset*, pp. 1, 2.

[2] The name of Mancetter near Atherstone contains the first syllable of the Romano-British *Manduessedum*, borne by an adjacent station on Watling Street.

[3] This river-name probably survives in the name of the village of Leire, situated near to the head-waters of a stream which joins the Soar some seven miles above Leicester.

from Colchester to Lincoln, not a single Romano-British name seems to have been adopted into English speech. Throughout this eastern country, with the rarest of exceptions, there have survived from the recorded nomenclature of Roman Britain only the names of a few towns of outstanding importance, and of a series of forts along the Saxon Shore,[1] which may well have become familiar to the Saxon raiders of the fifth century during the expeditions preliminary to the first Saxon settlements.[2]

But the disappearance of the names of Romano-British road-stations should not be regarded as a clue to the general fate of the Romano-British population. Many of these stations were very small places. Their life must always have depended upon the flow of traffic along the main provincial roads and when this was interrupted, early in the course of the Saxon invasions, there was little probability that either the places or their names would survive. It was in farms and upland villages, far from the economic nerve-centres of the province, and therefore little affected by their atrophy, that the resistant strength of the Romano-

[1] It is probable that Brancaster in Norfolk contains the first syllable of the Romano-British *Branodunum*, and that *Ythancaestir*, the early English name of Bradwell-on-Sea in Essex, is derived from *Othona*, the Roman name of the fort on the wall of which the ancient Saxon church of Bradwell stands. There is no doubt that the names *Regulbium* (Reculver), *Rutupiae* (Richborough) and *Anderida*, borne by other forts of the same series, were familiar to the first English settlers.

[2] A certain allowance should no doubt be made for the possibility that in some cases, a Romano-British place-name may have survived the Saxon conquest for a time, and been replaced by a new English name at a later period. In Bede's time, for example, the place which has been known as Tadcaster ever since the eleventh century was called *Kaelcacaestir*, a compound which obviously contains the Romano-British name *Calcaria*, borne by the first station on the Roman road from York to Chester. The second station on this road was known to Bede under its Roman name *Campodunum* but there is no later trace of this name, and the site of the station cannot be precisely identified. On the other hand, the district in which these names occur belonged to the British kingdom of Elmet, which was not conquered by the Angles of Northumbria until the seventh century, and it would clearly be unsafe to draw general conclusions about the history of eastern England from the survival of British names in a region which, like this, escaped the first impetus of the English attack.

British population lay. The British names which survived the Saxon conquest in greatest number are those of natural features familiar throughout a whole country-side—names of hills, woods, and above all rivers. It is only in recent years, and principally through the work of Ekwall on English river-names,[1] that it has become possible to form an estimate of the importance of this British element in English local nomenclature. It is not the least merit of this great work that it has made it impossible for any future historian to be satisfied with a simple solution of the problem of British survival. No reader of Professor Ekwall's book can escape the conclusion that throughout the North, in the central and western Midlands, and in Wessex, nothing but prolonged intercourse between the Britons and their conquerors could have preserved the innumerable British names of streams and rivers which survived the Anglo-Saxon invasion. The rarity of these names in Sussex, and in the counties along the eastern coast between the Humber and the Thames is no less apparent. Professor Ekwall writes as a philologist, and keeps close to his material. But there is an air of historical finality about his judgment that "the old theory of a wholesale extermination or displacement of the British population is no doubt erroneous or exaggerated, but it may come near the truth in the districts first conquered."

The British names of woods and hills have not been studied so minutely as the names of rivers, but it is already evident that their distribution has much the same general character. Within or on the fringe of the region which seems to have been occupied in the first phase of English settlement, the Chiltern Hills, the forest of Kesteven, and Barroc, the wood which gave name to Berkshire, all kept their British designations.[2] Andred, the great forest which

[1] *English River-Names*, Oxford, 1928.

[2] In the preface to his life of King Alfred, Asser states that Berkshire derives its name from a wood called Berroc. On the meaning of this name see Ekwall, *Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, p. 37.

in King Alfred's time seems to have been continuous from eastern Sussex to western Hampshire,[1] bore a name related to, and perhaps derived from, that of the Roman fort Anderida. On the other hand, few British names of lesser woods are known to have survived within this region of primary English settlement. Penge, a Celtic name meaning "head of the wood," remains a solitary piece of evidence for the fact that a British-speaking population within sight of London survived the English conquest for a considerable period. In the Midlands and the western shires of Wessex, such names, though never common, become something more than isolated curiosities. The great forests of Lyme and Arden, the lesser woodlands of Cannock in Staffordshire, Morfe and Kinver in the Severn valley, Kemble in Gloucestershire, Melchet and Pamber in Hampshire, Braydon, Savernake, Chute, and Panchet in Wiltshire, Mendip in Somerset, all bore names which had descended from the time before the English conquest. Woodland names, which in any case were far less common, were clearly less resistant to change than the names of streams and rivers, but the evidence which they yield for a British survival is by no means inconsiderable.

It is clear, in fact, that in many parts of western England and the Midlands, the chief physical features of the countryside kept their British names throughout the period of the English invasions. It is much harder to come to any definite conclusion about the extent to which the names of British villages persisted into the Anglo-Saxon age. There are many English villages which bear, and apparently have always borne, British names. But when they are considered closely, by far the greater number of these names are found to be themselves names of natural features. Pentridge in Dorset and the identical Pentrich in Derbyshire are really British hill-names borne by villages adjacent to the heights to which the names must first have been

[1] According to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, it stretched westwards for 120 miles or more from the mouth of the river Lympne.

applied.[1] The survival of these names proves the bare fact of local intercourse between Britons and Englishmen. But there is no means of determining whether at Pentrich and Pentridge English settlers have occupied a British village called after an adjacent hill or given a British hill-name to a new village of their own. That Romano-British settlements might be named after some natural feature is made clear by a number of the names recorded in the Antonine Itinerary. The hamlet of Wall on Watling Street occupies the site of a station which in Roman times was called *Letocetum*, a name meaning simply "grey wood." It is quite possible that the identical name Lytchett, borne by two adjacent villages in Dorset, was the name of a Romano-British village, and not merely of a conspicuous piece of woodland. But there can never be any certainty in such cases, and although names like Pentrich and Lytchett point conclusively to the survival of British-speaking peoples in the country around these places, they cannot be used as evidence for the continuity of British and Anglo-Saxon village life.

Here and there, a Romano-British name has been perpetuated under conditions which illustrate the danger of arguing closely from the mere fact of survival. The place-name in Berkshire still preserves the memory of the station called *Spinae* on the Roman road from Cirencester to Silchester, but in the ninth century, this name denoted not a place of habitation but a piece of woodland.[2] In other

[1] These names are discussed by Ekwall, *Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, p. 346, who suggests that they are identical with Pentyrch in Glamorgan, and that each of them may mean "boars' hill." A long series of forms for Pentridge is set out in Fägersten's *Place-Names of Dorset*, p. 103. The history of the name is taken back into the eighth century by a charter dated in 762, written for King Cynewulf of Wessex *in loco qui dicitur Pentric* (*Cartulary of Muchelney Abbey*, Somerset Record Society, p. 47). There is no reference to Pentrich in Derbyshire earlier than Domesday Book, where it appears as *Pentric*, a form which is supported by later documents.

[2] Birch, *Cartularium Saxonicum*, No. 366. The somewhat complicated history of the name is discussed by Ekwall, *Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, p. 413.

cases, a Romano-British name has been transferred to a new site by a process which can still be traced. The Midland *Letocetum* survives, not as the name of Wall on Watling Street, but as the first element in the name of Lichfield, two miles away.[1] Lichfield clearly came into being as a new English settlement in a *feld*, or stretch of open country, which derived its name from the adjacent Roman works of Letocetum. The history of the name *Pennocrucium*, borne by the next station westwards on Watling Street, is more complicated but equally suggestive. The site of this station has recently been identified on rising ground close to the point where Watling Street crosses the stream now called the river Penk.[2] In course of time, and probably soon after the English occupation of the surrounding country, the name *Pennocrucium* in a vernacular form was transferred from the site to the stream.[3] Later, the stream in turn gave name to the village on its bank which is now called Penkridge,[4] with the result that a name meaning " hill-summit " became attached to a place in the bottom of a shallow valley. Historically, the survival of these British names is interesting as evidence that the districts in which they occur had not yet been denuded of their British inhabitants at the time when they came into English possession. But the later desertion or insignificance of the sites to which the Romano-British names had been applied strongly suggests that the life of the Romano-British communities once settled there had been broken in the age of the English conquest.

[1] This important identification was first made by Henry Bradley in a communication to *The Academy* dated 30 October, 1886. It is reprinted in his *Collected Papers*, 117–8.

[2] I am indebted to Mr. Gerald P. Mander for information about this site.

[3] In the foundation charter of the tenth-century college of Wolverhampton, which has only been preserved in a late copy, the river " Penchrich " forms part of the boundary of one of the estates with which the charter deals (*Monasticon*, VIII, 1444).

[4] Which had come into being before, and probably long before, 958, when Edgar as king of the Mercians made a charter *in loco famoso qui dicitur Pencric* (*Cartularium Saxonicum*, No. 1041).

Evidence so definite as this is rarely forthcoming. Nevertheless, the impression of a broken life given by the history of names like Lichfield and Penkridge is confirmed by the general character of the British names which have survived in the greater part of England. If any considerable number of British villages had survived into the Old English period, it is at least probable that they would have left some trace of their existence more definite than the names of natural features on which the argument for a British survival chiefly turns. Among the numerous names of woods, streams and hills adopted by the English settlers, there might be expected to occur at least a few unmistakable habitation-names. Here and there, in a long series of British village-names, at least an occasional British personal name ought to have been preserved. There should have been some names illustrating the possession of land by persons or tribes to set beside the monotonous succession of names referring to obvious features of the country-side. That such names can hardly be found until the far south-west of England has been reached is a very serious obstacle to the belief that the place-names which have survived from Roman Britain reflect the continuous life of an organised Romano-British society.

It is, in fact, probable that this society offered little resistance to the forces making for its dissolution. The decay of the economic organisation which had supported the villas of Roman Britain had begun in the fourth century, and it was probably complete before the Saxons passed from raiding to settlement. It is not surprising that no place-names implying the existence of this system—such as the Gaulish *Fundus Floriacus* or the British *Villa Faustini*—occur among the names taken over by the English settlers. The native villages of Roman Britain had more vitality, and the evidence of coins [1] makes it probable that some of

[1] On the barbarous imitations of the coins of the House of Constantine which form an important part of this evidence see Donald Atkinson, *The Romano-British Site on Lowbury Hill in Berkshire*, 74–5.

them long survived the economic severance of Britain from the Empire. Here and there, especially in the south-west, a single village, or even a group of villages, may have become merged without any breach of continuity into the expanding English society of the sixth century. But the standard of life within these villages was low, and it is probable that their inhabitants were living very near to the margin of subsistence. It is altogether unlikely that a British village which lay in the path of a Saxon raiding-party possessed the reserves of stock and grain which would enable it to recover from the visitation. There may have been many parts of Britain in which the successors of the fifth-century raiders, after a generation of inconclusive warfare, took possession at last of a deserted country-side.

But the disappearance of British villages does not imply the extermination of their inhabitants. A rural population which is not anchored to the soil by a heavy agricultural equipment has at least the option of changing its way of life in response to new conditions. No ancient writer has described the reaction of the British countryman to the shock of the English invasions. But there is conclusive evidence that at an early date, large numbers of Britons had come to acquiesce in English rule. The Kentish peasantry of the sixth century included men of free personal condition who were descended from the Romano-British population of the south-east.[1] The laws of Ine show that within a kingdom of Wessex which did not yet include Cornwall or western Devon there were Britons who possessed estates comparable in size with the endowment of an undistinguished English nobleman.[2] There were many British slaves in Wessex, but there were also free British peasants who possessed the hide of land which was the traditional holding of the English ceorl, and whose lives were valued

[1] Liebermann, *Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, II, 2, p. 564, came definitely to this conclusion in his discussion of the *lætas* who are mentioned in Ethelbert's laws.

[2] A passage in Ine's laws (24.2) shows that a man of British descent might possess as much as five hides of land.

at the considerable sum of 120 shillings each.[1] It is natural to assume that this British population was concentrated in Wiltshire and in Wessex beyond Selwood, where an exceptional number of British names still survives. But Ine's laws were issued generally for the whole of his kingdom; there was a British strain in the West Saxon royal house itself,[2] and there is no evidence that the West Saxons in any part of their territory or at any period of their history had refused to come into peaceable relations with such Britons as were willing to pay them tribute. There is, moreover, no reason to suppose that the Britons who survived the English conquest, in Wessex or elsewhere, were confined to districts which their conquerors did not wish to occupy. Here and there, an isolated name such as that of Clumber in Sherwood Forest suggests the survival of a British population in country which has always been thinly peopled. But the general distribution of such names seems to imply that outside the range of the first invasions for settlement, a British element had been incorporated into the main body of English society at an early date. And the numerous British river-names which have persisted in the Midlands point to the association of many Britons with the English settlers by whom the heavy soils of this country were first brought into general cultivation.

The Celtic names which are the best evidence for this association tell something of its general character. It has sometimes been said that they were learned from the British captives whose existence is admitted by the sternest advocates of the extermination theory. Fifty years ago, it was easier to hold this opinion than it is to-day, for it is irreconcilable with either the number or the variety of the British names revealed by the scholarship of the last two generations. Taken as a whole, these names are far too

[1] Ine, 32.

[2] Whatever may have been the origin of the enigmatical name Cerdic, the name Cædwalla (Old British *Cadwallōn*) borne by Ine's predecessor points very clearly to a British element in his ancestry.

well preserved to be dismissed as fragments of ill-apprehended speech casually acquired by English farmers from broken men and women carried by war into their households. They imply that in northern, central, and western England there was a period of considerable length in which at least the bare elements of the British language were familiar to many Englishmen.[1] Within the country to the north-east of the middle Thames, which according to English tradition was conquered in 571, it is perhaps conceivable that the first English settlers might have acquired the Roman name of Dorchester, the British names of the rivers now known as Ray and Lovat, and the British words incorporated in the names Brickhill, Chetwood, Brill, and probably Bernwood, by memorising the local information which they extracted from their captives. But the mere reproduction of isolated sounds conveyed in an unintelligible language would be very unlikely to preserve the original plural form of the British stream-name which has given rise to the place-name Wendover.[2]

The argument for a phase of peaceful intercourse between

[1] The most conclusive evidence of such familiarity is the remarkable name *Beneficce*, which according to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* was borne by the Hertfordshire river Beane in the tenth century. There seems no doubt that in this name a British adjective closely related to the Welsh *bychan*, "small," is compounded with a British river-name *Ben* or *Bene*. In ancient British compound names, the defining element has the first place, as in Malvern, which corresponds to a Welsh *Moel fryn*, "bare hill." The fact that the order of the elements is reversed in *Benefícce* shows that this name is comparatively a late formation, and it may well be little if any older than the beginning of the Anglo-Saxon invasions. In any case, its survival shows that the English settlers of north Hertfordshire had more than a casual acquaintance with British speech. See Ekwall, *English River-Names*, 27, 8; *Place-Names of Hertfordshire* (E.P.N.S.), p. 1.

[2] In the only Anglo-Saxon document which mentions Wendover (Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Wills*, p. 22) the name appears in the dative plural form *æt Wændofron*. It is clearly derived from the chalk stream which rises near the village. This and other British river-names, such as Andover, which are preserved in a plural form in English place-names, are discussed by Ekwall in *English River-Names*, p. lxxxiii, where it is observed that the form "implies a considerable familiarity with British on the part of the Anglo-Saxons who adopted the names."

Britons and Anglo-Saxons is strengthened by the fact that a small number of British words were adopted by the English settlers and used in the formation of new place-names.[1] The list has not been greatly extended by recent research. But in estimating the historical significance of these words, the frequency with which each of them was employed is hardly less important than the question of their total number, and in this direction some notable results have been obtained. The most interesting of them is the discovery that an Old English word *funta*, derived from an Old British word *funtōn*, which meant spring or stream, was widely distributed over a great part of southern England. The British word from which it was derived survives in the place-names Fontmell in Dorset and Fonthill in Wiltshire, each of which represents a pre-English stream-name. It is preceded by an Old English personal name in the place-names Fovant in Wiltshire, Havant in Hampshire, Bedfont in Middlesex, Wansunt near Bexley in Kent, and Tolleshunt in Essex;[2] in Chadshunt in Warwickshire it follows one of the few British personal names which passed into English usage;[3] and it is compounded with Old English substantive words in Teffont in Wiltshire, and Boarhunt and Fontley in Hampshire.[4] It occurs in Chalfont in Buckinghamshire, Mottisfont in Hampshire, and Urchfont in Wiltshire in association with a first element

[1] Such as *cumb* from British *kumbā*, "valley"; *torr*, "hill" or "peak"; *carr*, "rock."

[2] Fobbanfuntan (genitive). *Cart. Sax.*, 588; Hamanfunta, *Cart. Sax.*, 707; Bedefunt, Domesday Book; Wantesfonte, *Assize Roll of* 1270; Tollesfuntan (dative), *Place-Names of Essex*, 306.

[3] Ceadelesfuntan (dative), *Cart. Sax.*, 883. The Old English personal name Ceadel is one of a group of related names containing the Celtic stem *catu, cad*, "battle," which are discussed by Förster in his article "Keltisches Wortgut im Englischen" (*Festgabe für Felix Liebermann*), pp. 179 *et seqq.*

[4] Teofunten (dative), *Cart. Sax.*, 1138; Byrhfunt', *Cart. Sax.*, 1161; Funtelei, Domesday Book. The first element of the name Teffont is an Old English word *teo*, "boundary"; that of Boarhunt is the genitive case of the Old English *burh*, "fortress." In Fontley, *funta* precedes the Old English *leah*, "clearing."

which cannot be decisively explained, and it has been found in several minor names in Surrey and Sussex. Up to the present time, no examples of the word have been noted in ancient Anglian territory, and it is probable that it was never taken into use by the English settlers of that country. But the range of its distribution and the variety of the elements with which it is compounded in the south, show that there, at least, for a considerable period, it was current in ordinary English speech.

The British names which have survived the English conquest are sufficiently numerous to show that the British element in Anglo-Saxon society should not be ignored by those who wish to understand its composition. It may be added that, in real life, this element must have been much stronger than would be inferred from the local names which remain to prove its existence. The obliteration of British place-names may well have been a very slow process, and the British language may have survived for generations in a region where it has left no trace. The extreme rarity of British names in the country around Lincoln might be taken to imply something approaching an extermination of its British inhabitants, if the history of the name Lincoln did not prove that the Roman *Lindum colonia* passed at an early date into English usage through the medium of contemporary British speech.[1] Even in Sussex, where the river-names themselves are mostly English, the disappearance of British names may be due to the congestion rather than the ferocity of the earliest English settlers. There is no need to qualify the generalisation that in the east and south-east of England, only a poor remnant of the British population survived the first wave of Anglo-Saxon immigration. But it is certainly dangerous to argue from the absence of British place-names in a particular region to the massacre or dislodgment of its entire pre-English population.

[1] The Anglo-Saxon form *Lindcylene* is derived from *Lindum colonia* by a normal succession of British and English sound-changes through the intermediate British form *Lindocolina* recorded by Bede.

The general trend of all this evidence suggests very strongly that everywhere outside the region of the first Saxon conquests, a considerable, and in some parts a large number of Britons passed by gradual absorption into the body of Anglo-Saxon society. But in estimating the historical significance of these British names, it is before all things necessary to keep a sense of proportion. Apart from Cornwall, and a fringe of debatable land along the Welsh border, there is no part of England in which the British element is dominant in local nomenclature, or in which place-names give any support to the belief that the lines of English settlement reproduce an earlier Celtic pattern.[1] In regard to Kent, where a force of Germanic mercenaries had been retained in British service for a considerable part of the fifth century,[2] a Swedish scholar has recently observed that "apart from the names of a small number of rivers, the names of Keltic origin may almost be counted on the five fingers of the hand."[3] In regard to Dorset, where as late

[1] The British place-names of north-western England raise a number of special problems. In the aggregate, they are numerous; and in some parts of Lancashire—notably in the Fylde, in the hills to the north and east of Manchester, and in the eastern part of West Derby Hundred (Ekwall, *Place-Names of Lancashire*, 225–6)—they occur in groups which suggest that the continuity of British life in those parts may never have been completely broken. Even there, however, they are outnumbered by names which are obviously of English origin, and elsewhere in the north-west, they are distributed with no marked tendency towards agglomeration, among the English, Norse, and Gaelic names which make the local nomenclature of this region the most complex in England. In Westmorland, British names are comparatively rare; and in Cumberland, where they are numerous, the question of their origin and significance is complicated by the probability that some of them are due to the conquest of this country by the Britons of Strathclyde after the collapse of the Northumbrian kingdom in the ninth century (see Ekwall, *Scandinavians and Celts in the North-West of England*, 104–17).

[2] Gildas, *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae*, c. 23, where the barbarians invited into Britain after the failure of the British appeal to Aetius are said to have been retained in British pay *multo tempore*. The rarity of British place-names in Kent is one of the facts which suggest that the English settlement of this country was carried out by invaders of a later generation than Hengest and his followers, who must have become well acquainted with the Romano-British nomenclature of the south-east.

[3] Wallenberg, *The Place-Names of Kent*, p. iv.

as the ninth century the British language was not quite extinct,[1] another Swedish scholar has estimated that of a thousand names included in his book, only about a dozen are of Celtic origin.[2] If the place-names of all England are brought under review, it is impossible to escape the impression that they represent a Germanic occupation of the lowlands of south Britain, which was carried out in stages of varying impetus, but everywhere in overwhelming force. As place-name studies advance by the accumulation of fresh material and the further analysis of what is already known, the names which point to a British element in Anglo-Saxon society will stand out more clearly than at present from the English nomenclature in which they are embedded. For some, at least, which are now meaningless, an explanation will probably be found. But they will always remain as isolated survivals from a vanished world.

[1] Stevenson, *Asser's Life of King Alfred*, p. 249.
[2] Fägersten, *The Place-Names of Dorset*, p. xv.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH MEDIEVAL SCHOLARSHIP BETWEEN 1660 AND 1730

By Professor David C. Douglas, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.

Read 13 *January*, 1938

Though the subject of this paper is over-large, its purpose was begotten of piety, not presumption. If, therefore, I lack the confidence which pertains to discovery, I am not for that reason without my apology; and I aspire to the hope that the Fellows of this Society may deem it a seemly relaxation to pause from their labours for the space of an hour in order to reflect gratefully upon some of their forerunners in learning. Between 1660 and 1730 English medieval scholarship advanced to a notable achievement, and the names of the chief men who contributed thereto are almost household words to all modern students of medieval England. But the history of that pregnant movement of research has still to be written[1] and few of us would claim that we had made full use of the work of our predecessors. Consequently, since the distant converse of dwarfs with giants conduces to humility, it may be salutary to recall once more this great adventure of English erudition, and profitable, also, with an eye to the present, to speculate upon the cause and character of its astonishing success. The praise of famous men has earned an ancient commendation and even a cork may sustain a draught of fishes.

I am well aware that the selection of these dates is to some extent arbitrary, and that, in particular, the wide-

[1] I propose in a forthcoming publication to consider some of the questions which are raised in this paper.

spread study of medieval England was no novelty at the time of the Restoration. The seventeenth century was throughout marked by the strangely consistent appeal which the majority of its opposed leaders made to medieval precedent, and no fundamental break in the assiduous cultivation of English medieval antiquities is to be discerned between the days of Laurence Nowell and those of Thomas Madox. Robert Bruce Cotton and Robert Harley were in one sense partners in a common enterprise, and the links which connect Spelman with Wake, Ussher with Stillingfleet, and even Selden with Hale are not such as can be broken by any facile dichotomy. Twysden looked back to Savile and forward to Hearne, whilst Hickes, nourishing the rising genius of Wanley, paid reverence not only to Junius and Marshall but also to Joscelin and Lisle. Hearne and Tanner both laboured to enlarge the work of Leland, and Gibson remodelled the *Britannia* of Camden in a manner which had been desired by Thomas Browne.[1] The work of the earlier scholars in this procession of learning was thus continuously developed by their successors, and it was a corporate effort sustained for the space of nearly a hundred and fifty years which was brought at last to its close by Hearne's editions and Wanley's catalogues, by the *Fœdera* of Rymer and by the *Concilia* of 1737.

Nevertheless, the Restoration began an epoch in English scholarship as surely as it marked a change in English politics, and the seventy years which followed witnessed a positive achievement in medieval learning which was distinct alike by reason of its extent and from the unity of its corporate character. It would not be difficult, for example, to defend the opinion that Old English studies have never progressed with greater rapidity than in the years which elapsed between the appearance of Somner's

[1] " 'Tis time to observe Occurences, and let nothing remarkable escape us. The Supinity of elder days hath left so much in silence, or time hath so matyred the Records, that the most industrious Heads do finde no easie work to erect a new *Britannia* " (*Hydriotaphia :* Preface.)

Dictionary in 1659 and the death of Wanley in 1726, or that, during this period the scholars, albeit sustaining a great tradition, made to their subject a particular contribution. Characteristic of this endeavour was the development of Anglo-Saxon studies at Oxford where at first Marshall and Hickes laboured at Lincoln to enlarge the work of Junius, and where later, after William Nicolson had become the first official College preceptor in this subject, Edward Thwaites elicited from Queen's that "profluvium of Saxonists" which (as was said) "poured forth from the House of Eglesfield." [1] The activities of these Oxford "Saxonists" have indeed attracted such attention that scant justice has been done by some later commentators to the Saxon research which at the same time was prosecuted in the University of Matthew Parker. Yet, at Cambridge, Robert Sheringham and Aylett Sammes were both trained, and, at Cambridge also, there was produced in 1722 the magnificent edition of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* wherein John Smith developed the earlier labours of Wheloc. The energy which at this time transformed the study of the Old English past was not in fact confined to either of the two Universities or even to both. It was not as a Fellow of Lincoln College, nor yet as Dean of Worcester, but as a hunted renegade that George Hickes advanced by the sheer force of his dominant personality to be its acknowledged leader, and the scattered research, which he directed to its climax in the monumental *Thesaurus* of 1703–5, was almost national in its scope. When Humphrey Wanley, his pupil, who perhaps taught Hickes as much as he learnt from him, finally left Oxford for London at the beginning of the eighteenth century, it meant that Old English learning was beginning to concentrate in the metropolis, and when, in 1726, Wanley lay dropsical and dying in his London lodging,[2] he could look back on the astonishing progress

[1] Cf. Firth, *The School of English Language and Literature* (1909).

[2] For malicious descriptions of the last months of Wanley's life and of the unfortunate marriage he then contracted, see Hearne, *Coll.*, x, p. 377, and Portland MSS. Rep. v, p. 638; vii, pp. 439, 442.

that Saxon studies had made during his lifetime. Modern criticism has done nothing but emphasise the magnitude of this achievement. The technical excellence of Smith's *Bede* aroused the enthusiasm of Charles Plummer when at last that book was superseded in 1896.[1] The reputation of Hickes probably stands higher to-day than at any time during the last fifty years. And (to quote Mr. Sisam) "one can seldom look at an Anglo-Saxon manuscript without thinking gratefully of Humphrey Wanley."[2]

The particular advance in English medieval scholarship that occurred between 1660 and 1730 was thus exhibited in the progress of Saxon studies, and it could be illustrated with equal ease by reference to the research which was at the same time devoted to the problems of later medieval history. The Norman Conquest, for example, remained the object of an especial attention, and retained its fascination alike for political propagandists and for objective historians.[3] After the Restoration, as before, it was still considered, even in some erudite quarters, to be more decent to speak of the Norman "acquisition" or perhaps of the Norman "purchase" of England, and the astonishing *Argumentum Anti-Normannicum* of 1682,[4] with its pictorial representa-

[1] Cf. Plummer's remarks in his edition of the *Ecclesiastical History* (i, Preface, esp. p. lxxx). Smith apparently used for his Latin text three out of the four best manuscripts known to Plummer. Both he and Plummer were unacquainted with a fifth important manuscript discussed by Dr. Lowe in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xli, p. 245.

[2] Sisam in *Rev. Eng. Studies*, vii, pp. 7–9.

[3] In 1613 John Hayward, in the preface to his remarkable *Lives of the Three Norman Kings of England*, had shown himself well aware that a study of the Norman Conquest might readily be made to serve the needs of propaganda. Some more modern scholars have derived yet deeper satisfaction from a conviction that a solution to the problems of eleventh-century history should be sought in the political sentiments of their own time. They have possessed their reward, even as did Sir William Temple when in 1695 he devoted so many pages of his *Introduction to the History of England* to a discussion of the substitution of William for Edgar the Atheling. William Nicolson, who was himself committed to the Revolution settlement, found in this book "such Reflections as become a Statesman" (*English Historical Library*, ed. 1736, p. 76).

[4] Sometimes attributed to William Atwood but more probably the work of Edward Cooke.

tions of the social contract made between William and a lady described as "Britannia his Sacred Queen," was representative of a fairly large class of literature. Then, as now, these events of eleventh-century history generated a strange heat in unlikely bosoms, and they inspired the flow of much flamboyant ink. But, amid the welter of argument, Robert Brady was, despite his own partisanship, making an important contribution to these studies by means of his elaborate and careful use of authorities. Brady's *Introduction to the Old English History*, which in its collected form appeared in 1684, was a notable piece of savage and constructive criticism, and its main function was to insist that the sources must be examined in the light of their meaning to the men who wrote them. Progress could only be assured if the old arguments, illustrated by time-worn extracts, were replaced by a new investigation of the authorities themselves, and in particular by a more complete and more accurate presentation of the great chronicles of medieval England.

Thus, during these seventy years, the earlier tradition of Savile and Camden, of Selden, Jennings and Twysden, was itself gradually transformed. Henry Wharton, with the enthusiasm of his shrill and perverted [1] genius, made here, before his early death in 1695, an indelible mark upon all future study of English ecclesiastical history, and the majority of the monastic annals which were later to be edited with such scholarly care by Luard were investigated and printed between 1684 and 1691 by William Fulman and Thomas Gale. At the same time, men such as Joseph Sparke [2] at Peterborough, and Thomas Rud [3] at Durham

[1] See the extracts from his Latin autobiography printed by D'Oyly, *Life of Sancroft* (1821), ii, pp. 105–54.

[2] Despite his reputed eccentricity of being "mad a quarter of a year together in every year" (Hearne, *Coll.*, viii, p. 382), Sparke's *Historiæ Cœnobii Burgensis Scriptores Varii* was a notable production. It contains material which is still not to be found elsewhere.

[3] Thomas Rud in collaboration with Thomas Bedford produced in 1732 an edition of Simeon of Durham's *Historia Dunelmensis Ecclesiæ*, which superseded the version which had appeared in Twysden's *Scriptores*.

were devoting themselves to the chronicles of the particular sees they served. It was, in short, an age of assiduous editing carried on in many diverse quarters, and, despite occasional backslidings towards inaccuracy and undue haste, a steady advance was maintained, until at last in the long series of chronicles issued by Thomas Hearne during his tempestuous career a more faithful reproduction of the manuscript texts was offered to the public than had ever been achieved before. Hearne's credulities have been sufficiently mocked, and his criticism was often beyond defence. But the meticulous care of his transcription was such that it was made a reproach to him by his enemies:

> One Rule—[it was noted] he generally speaking closely observed was always to follow his Authors religiously. Their Mistakes by this means were punctually copied and sacredly preserved—*Sic MS* he has noted perhaps in the Margin to shew that he was not ignorant of the Error in the Copy—Still amid all these Regulations the Text is generally kept *purely corrupt* and scarce a Blunder thro' the whole but what is very industriously preserved.[1]

The fault was one for which generations of scholars have had cause to be grateful, and the sneer illustrates better than could columns of eulogy the progress that was being made towards a proper presentation of medieval chronicles.

It is not necessary to reiterate familiar names in order to illustrate the manner in which research of a special character and directed towards particular ends was at this time widely pursued in England under the influence of outstanding scholars. This was not a movement confined to a few specialists or to a fortunate constellation of pre-eminent men. The strength of English medieval scholarship in this period derived from the fact that it was the

Rud in opposition to opinions previously expressed by Bale and Selden argued in his fine preface for the true attribution of the authorship of the History.

[1] *Impartial Memorials of Thomas Hearne* (1736), pp. 25, 26; cf. *Times Literary Supplement*, 6 June, 1935.

common concern of an ever-increasing number of English squires, of lawyers and particularly of doctors, of clergymen scattered up and down the rectories and vicarages of England. The assiduous cultivation of local history at this time was a further mark of this pervading interest, and the correspondence of William Nicolson and Samuel Gale, the diaries of such as Ralph Thoresby and Abraham de la Pryme, demonstrate its ramifications. Dugdale's *Warwickshire* and Thoroton's *Nottinghamshire* were the two great county histories of the age, but they stand out from amid an extensive production. Sir Robert Atkyns in Gloucestershire, Sir Henry Chauncy in Hertfordshire, Robert Wright in Rutland, and White Kennet at Ambrosden were representative of a large company whose abilities were not always equal to their zeal; and the earlier example of Dodsworth in the north, and of Somner in the south-east was followed during this period with varying degrees of success by men like Torre and Nathaniel Johnston on the one hand and by writers such as John Harris and the Batteleys on the other. Roger Gale's anonymous folio of 1722 on the Honour of Richmond was for all its defects a notable example of the pervading antiquarian enthusiasm which was thus being profitably diverted into the channels of local investigation.

The variety of this production came from its being made by many and devoted hands. Its value depended to a large extent upon its originality. Books such as the *Baronage* of Dugdale carried with them their own especial faults, but they are so often criticised as if they were written yesterday that it is sometimes easy to forget that the research behind them was pioneer work. It would not be difficult to illustrate at length the new departures in medieval investigation which were made by the scholars of this age. The first Englishman, for example, to demonstrate the importance of originals rather than cartulary copies for the technical study of the feudal charter was probably Thomas Madox, and the first competent presentation of a Middle English text was possibly Hearne's edition of Robert of

Gloucester.[1] The originality of these men needs little emphasis, but it may be permissible to recall attention to two specific comments upon the use of medieval material, the one made in 1684 by Robert Brady and the other in 1711 by Thomas Madox.

The *Records* I have used—said Brady—are Faithfully Cited, and like wise the *Historians*, who are such as lived in the *Times* when the *Things* I *Vouch them for, were acted*—whose *Writings* in very many things do agree with the *Publick Records* as to the *Matter* and *Time* though not as to the *Form* and *Composition* ; and this I Affirm from my own Collating and Comparing of them.[2]

And here is Madox :

Great regard is indeed to be had to the Annals or history contained in Registers of Churches ; and in the Manuscript collections of Ancient Writers ; particularly in relation to things done in their Own life-time, or lying within their personal knowledg. But no doubt the Publick Records of the Crown and Kingdom are the most important and the most authentick of All. And these are the Foundation which sustain the whole Fabrick of this History. A Foundation solid and unshaken. [3]

Inasmuch as the twentieth century has been marked by a greater insistence upon the especial value of record sources for the study of English medieval history, these men may surely claim an astonishing modernity.

It is perhaps a reproach to us that pioneer work of this originality has not been more uniformly followed up, for our deficiencies in this matter become apparent if we merely reflect that the only edition of *Heming's Cartulary* is still that of 1723, or that very little of the third book of the *Liber Eliensis* has ever been printed apart from the long extracts which are to be found in *Anglia Sacra*. It would certainly tax the energies of a committee working for a generation to supersede the *Exchequer* of Madox or Wanley's catalogue of 1705, but there is still very much to be done

[1] D. N. Smith, *Warton's History of English Poetry*, p. 9.
[2] Brady, *Introduction to the Old English History*, " Advertisement."
[3] Madox, *Exchequer* (1711), p. iv.

in the re-editing of texts whose importance was first discovered for us by the labours of men working more than two centuries ago. Sometimes time has made this task impossible since disasters like the great fire which ravaged the Cottonian library in 1731 have on occasion given a unique value to the editions made before that date. Stubbs showed us how much our knowledge of one of the chief sources of the chronicle ascribed to Benedict of Peterborough derives from a fortunate transcript made by Wanley and used by Hearne ; [1] and it is for modern "Saxonists" to state what their study has gained from the fact that the Maldon Poem was printed as an appendix to Hearne's edition of John of Glastonbury.[2] Our restricted knowledge of the lost manuscript of Asser owes something to the edition made by Francis Wise in 1722,[3] and John Smith's great edition of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* incidentally preserved in an Appendix a valuable series of West Mercian Old English charters whose originals have since been lost.[4] Such examples taken from among many indicate afresh the claim of these scholars upon our gratitude and upon our study.

Not the least valuable result which would ensue if this whole movement in scholarship was submitted to the detailed investigation it deserves would be the revelation of material hidden in unexpected places. It is not surprising that Brady's work should contain much information concerning Domesday which is still not easily obtainable elsewhere, or that considerable later discussion upon the origin

[1] Stubbs, *Benedict of Peterborough* (Rolls Series), i, pp. xxi–xl. He adds the tribute : "It seldom falls to an editor to be able to bestow on the labours of his predecessors in the same task the unqualified praise that I can give to this edition."

[2] *Joannis Glastoniensis Chronica*, ed. Hearne (1726), ii, pp. 570–7 ; Wülker, *Grundgriss zur Geschichte der Angelsächsischen Litteratur*, pp. 334–8 ; E. D. Laborde, *Byrhtnoth and Maldon* (1936) ; E. V. Gordon, *The Battle of Maldon* (1937).

[3] Cf. Stevenson, *Asser's Life of King Alfred*, p. xliii.

[4] Smith, *Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ...Libri Quinque auctore...Bæda* (1722), pp. 764 sqq.

of the jury might have been avoided by a reference to Hickes's *Dissertatio Epistolaris.*[1] It is, however, perhaps something of a shock to find a remarkably good text of Ine's laws in an Appendix to that strange essay on the Phœnician contribution to English history which Aylett Sammes published in 1676 under the title of *Britannia Antiqua Illustrata*; and a superficial investigator into the development of the English baronage might well be excused if he omitted in his search Humphrey Hody's contribution to the Convocation Controversy.[2] We are all aware how much the study of English feudalism has owed to Spelman's essay on *Feuds and Tenures by Knight Service* which Edmund Gibson edited among the baronet's posthumous papers in 1698, but others among our predecessors in feudal study are perhaps less assiduously cultivated. Fabian Phillips, for example, was something of an eccentric. More royalist than the King he was particularly offended by the abolition of feudal tenures after the Restoration. He wrote voluminously on the subject and his work here is of quite exceptional interest in that it concerned the antiquity of institutions in the maintenance of which he was himself directly involved. The quaint titles of his very lengthy tracts—*Tenenda non Tollenda* or *Ligeancia Lugens*, for instance—concealed a mass of antiquarian learning; and his culminating folio on the *Established Government of England*, which was published in 1687 when its author was eighty-two years old, is a mine of information. The critical ability of Fabian Phillips was mediocre, and his literary style was repulsive.[3] But he combined in himself qualifications which have perhaps never coexisted in any other writer on English feudalism. He discussed feudal institutions as an antiquary in the age of Burnet, but he discussed them also in something of the spirit of Glanvill or of Bracton.

[1] *Thesaurus: Diss. Ep.*, pp. 33–44.

[2] Cf. Stenton, *English Feudalism* (1932), p. 86; Hody, *History of English Councils and Convocations* (1701), pp. 287, 288.

[3] "His parts," observed Anthony Wood (*Fasti*, ed. Bliss, ii, col. 5), "were never advanced when young by academical education."

Such haphazard examples of erudite activity are of themselves sufficient to emphasise afresh the wide range and the special quality of the research which marked the age. To this movement of inquiry, men of all parties and of all temperaments contributed. Non-jurors such as Sancroft and Collier shared here the interests of Whig ecclesiastics like Kennett and Hody, and the Middle Ages became the concern of men as divided in their opinions as were Prynne and Lloyd, Atterbury and Nicolson. The detailed achievements of the long succession of English scholars who devoted their lives to the study of medieval England between the time of Dugdale and that of Wake are not to be appraised in the course of a single paper or indeed of a single book. But it is permissible to inquire what were the general conditions which made possible such an astounding efflorescence in English medieval studies.

There can be little doubt that, after the Restoration as before, the main spur to medieval research in England came from the conviction that the burning questions which divided contemporary society could best be settled by means of an exhaustive examination of precedent. In the past, the circumstances of the Reformation had produced a marriage between ecclesiastical polemic and antiquarian zeal, and the constitutional debate had sent politicians and lawyers questing into the past. By the latter half of the seventeenth century such ardours had to some extent been sublimated, but ecclesiastical controversy and political argument still survived as the most potent sources of historical research. Thus George Hickes considered that Old English studies were especially to be commended in that they would supply an answer to "that never-ending question: Where was your Church before Luther?",[1] and the turning point in Matthew Hale's book on the Common Law was his discussion of the Norman Conquest. Fortescue Aland in 1714 eloquently defended historical

[1] Hickes to Bp. of Bristol 22 May, 1714 (Portland MSS., Rep. v, p. 445).

studies as conducing to constitutional and ecclesiastical stability,[1] and the valuable research of such as Atwood and Petyt, of George Harbin and Hilkiah Bedford was directed to similar propagandist ends. The same motives are also clearly to be discerned in the ecclesiastical scholarship of the early eighteenth century. The Convocation Controversy was in many respects undoubtedly dull. But the heats which it stimulated were directly responsible for Wake's *State of the Church*, and thus for the subsequent production of the *Concilia* of 1737.[2] A dominant characteristic of English medieval scholarship during the seventy years which followed the Restoration—perhaps even the chief reason for its remarkable progress—was the close inter-relation between historical research and the problems of contemporary life. This association was capable of inspiring an immense energy in men who held that in their study of medieval England they were probing questions that concerned their personal honour or even their personal salvation.

It might not even, perhaps, be too fanciful to discern a further cause for this productivity in the fact that the motives which inspired these scholars were particularly congenial to the race from which they sprang. The search for wisdom in precedent flourished as if naturally among a people whom foreign observers at a later date have praised especially for its reliance upon tradition rather than upon those wide general theories which claim universal validity.[3] Similarly, though Halifax might liken the

[1] *Difference between an Absolute and Limited Monarchy* (1714), pp. xiv, xv, lxix.

[2] E. F. Jacob, R. Hist. Soc. *Trans.*, 4th Series, vol. xv, pp. 91–131.

[3] "The instinct of every Englishman," remarked Emerson in 1856, "is to search for a precedent"; "the taste of this people is conservative"; "the stability of England is the security of the modern world." (*English Traits*, ed. 1883, pp. 109, 137, 167). Price Collier, another foreign observer, arrived at the same conclusions in 1902 (*England and the English*, pp. 253, 363): "The Englishman," he remarks, "looks back for his standard and makes precedent serve as his guide." "They are the last race of all to be fuddled and disturbed by new religions, new theories of government, new solutions of the problem of existence."

pleasures of research to those of " wrestling with a fine woman",[1] the close relation made by the scholars between inquiry and conduct has ever been more characteristic of what John Stow described as " the searching and unsatisfied spirits of the English." [2] Certainly, no explanation of the scholarly achievement of this age can ignore the crusading ardour of the men who made it. Some explanation of that astonishing production may be found in the mere contemplation of Prynne bending his earmarked head over his interminable pamphlets.[3] The dedicated energy of Hickes informed his wonderful " Preface to Ottley " as surely as it moved him to go to console his friends on the scaffold.[4] And the force of Thwaites appeared not only in his labours on Boethius but also on the occasion when he watched the amputation of his leg " without distortion or ho ", and rammed his fingers " like spickets " into his own spurting arteries.[5] The positive contributions which these men made to learning were extremely personal, and while the correspondence of the time shows how much of their achievement was due to collaboration, their work was in each outstanding case lit by an inward individual fire. Herein, also, they were fit products of the nation which they taught.[6]

The absence of any organisation of study in this period tempts speculation how far a great movement of scholar-

[1] Halifax, *Works*, ed. Raleigh, p. 249.

[2] Quoted by Firth in *Sir Walter Raleigh's History of the World.* See his *Essays*, ed. Davies (1938), p. 36.

[3] Cf. Aubrey's *Life of Prynne.*

[4] E. C. to Robert Hailey, 29 Jan., 1691 : " Mr. Ashton was executed at Tyburn.—He would not permit the Ordinary to pray with him but desired Sir Francis Child to let him have the divine that went along with him to perform the last ghostly offices, which was permitted. They say it was Divine Hicks and after him came little Cook of Islington, both non-jurats, and so he went into the other world." (Portland MSS., Rep. iii, p. 458.)

[5] Brome to Charlett, quoted in Nichols' *Literary Anecdotes*, iv, pp. 148, 149.

[6] Brunetière, for example, specifically contrasts the highly individual character of English literary expression with the " social " tendency of the French. (*Essays*, trans. D. N. Smith, esp. p. 52.)

ship is dependent upon the regimentation of research. During these seventy years the Universities, for example, gave little official lead in these matters. The Spelman lectureship at Cambridge was unique of its type, and it lapsed ; the Camden Chair at Oxford, despite the tendency of the lectures of Degory Wheare its first occupant,[1] soon became devoted almost exclusively to ancient history ; and the Regius Chairs of History and Modern Languages, established in 1724 at the instigation of Edmund Gibson, were originally designed to serve a political purpose and did not, during this period, serve to stimulate medieval research.[2] Similarly, the Society of Antiquaries was in abeyance during most of this period, and its revival in the early years of the eighteenth century by Wanley, Talman, Bagford and their friends was not fully to produce its beneficial results until a later generation. Towards the end of this period there were beginning to spring up local societies of which the *Gentlemen's Society* of Spalding [3] was the chief, and also associations such as Antiquity Hall at Oxford or the Zodiac Club of St. John's College, Cambridge. But these, though interesting in themselves, were mainly important as foreshadowing a later type of activity. Generally speaking, it may be said that the greatest movement which English medieval scholarship has ever seen took place without any great assistance from Professors, and without any substantial aid from official organisation. It derived from a widespread consciousness of the interest and the importance of the subject capable of stimulating unparalleled industry in remarkable individuals.

These conditions prevailed throughout the seventeenth century. But, after the Restoration, a new incentive to good historical production came in a modification of the motives and in an improvement of the technique of the earlier scholars. An increased specialisation began to

[1] Wheare, *Method of Reading Histories*, ed. 1698.
[2] Cf. N. Sykes, *Edmund Gibson*, pp. 95–105.
[3] Cf. Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, vi, pp. 1 sqq.

appear which was itself a mark of progress towards more modern conditions. The indiscriminate riot of erudition, characteristic of the earlier work, gave place to investigations which by their very limitation were more efficient, and English medievalists like Dugdale and Brady began to submit themselves to a narrower discipline.[1] As history gradually came to be regarded as a distinct branch of learning, a greater objectivity appeared in its investigation. The close connexion between antiquarian scholarship and current controversy had undoubtedly stimulated production, but it was apt to make history the handmaid of faction. This danger also was fairly met after the Restoration. The scientific interests of the age reacted upon medieval inquiries, and though it is impossible to particularise shortly about a general tendency, its scope may be perceived by a comparison of the spirit which animated the work of Wanley and Hickes, or by a perusal of that wonderful preface wherein Madox, at the outset of his greatest work, expressed for all future students of medieval England the aims which should animate their criticism of medieval sources.[2] Unflagging energy derived from a sense of the significant in medieval studies conditioned the work of these men as it had that of their predecessors, but their unique performance was due to the fact that this fervour was now being generally disciplined by specialisation, and purified by a fresh objectivity.

The enterprise of these scholars was moreover continuously fertilised by the consistent support which it received from educated England. It is unnecessary to illustrate, and easy to ridicule, the vagaries of private patronage, but it must be noted that, during the seventy years which followed the Restoration, English medievalists had little reason to complain of the manner in which their work was received. William Elstob lamented "evil days, cold

[1] Cf. Powicke, *Sir Henry Spelman and the Concilia*, esp. pp. 7, 8; Douglas, "William Dugdale the Grand Plagiary" in *History*, vol. XX, pp. 194, 195.

[2] Madox, *Exchequer* (1711), Preface and esp. pp. iii, iv.

patrons and neglected efforts,'' [1] and the reek of Rymer's garret [2] was a reproach to his generation. But these were exceptional cases of particular hardship, and when all due allowance is made for individual misfortunes, it remains true to say that during this period the medieval scholar in England could count on a public sympathetic to his studies. Preferment in the Anglican Church has perhaps never more consistently followed learned achievement, and towards the close of the seventeenth century, it might almost have seemed that medieval erudition was among the most certain qualifications for the episcopal bench. When the Church was adapting itself to the exigencies of the Revolution settlement, a most influential group of prelates—William Nicolson, Edmund Gibson and White Kennett among their number—were recruited from the ranks of distinguished medievalists, and William Wake was ideally qualified to preside over a Church which had long delighted to reward medieval learning. Nor were the laity backward in the encouragement of the study of medieval England. '' It is observed,'' wrote Thomas Madox in 1711, '' that the Science of Antiquities hath in this last age been cultivated with more industry and success than in several ages past,'' and he gave it as his opinion that the chief explanation of this was the '' Encouragement that hath been given to these studies by several persons of eminent learning and superior order in the realm.'' [3] The eulogy was justified, and it would be easy to multiply examples of the beneficent effects of this discriminating munificence. When Hearne for instance sold his numerous editions of medieval chronicles by subscription at half a guinea a volume he amassed a small fortune in the process ; [4]

[1] Cf. M. A. Richardson, *Reprints of Rare Tracts* (1843–8), vol. ii.

[2] For a graphic description see J. Caulfield, *Portraits, Memoirs and Characters of Remarkable Persons from the Revolution to the Death of George II*, i, pp. 51, 52 ; Hardy, *Syllabus of Documents in Rymer's Fœdera*, i, pp. xxiv, xxv.

[3] Madox, *Exchequer* (1711, p. i).

[4] '' Life of Hearne,'' p. 33, in *Lives of Leland Hearne and Wood* (1772).

and when Hickes as a political outcast issued at a very high price his huge folios of difficult Latin on the origins of the Teutonic languages, he was able to add to them a list of subscribers (headed by twenty-six peers of the realm) longer and more distinguished than could now be found for a similar work. This is no place to enlarge upon the debt of English literature to the aristocracy in an age justly famous for its patronage. But it deserves emphasis that a work of pure scholarship devoted to a medieval theme probably stood a better chance of a remuneration between 1660 and 1730 than it does to-day.

During these seventy years conditions in England were thus peculiarly congenial to the propagation of medieval studies. The solemn zeal which had sent the earlier generation on its search through medieval England had not expired, but at the same time the modern ideal of objective research was beginning to be understood. The scholars were personally worthy of their opportunity, and a large public was eager to welcome their work. In the light of these considerations the corporate achievement of the time is perhaps best to be understood. For by the third decade of the eighteenth century conditions were once again beginning to change, and the age of Enlightenment was not favourable to the acquisition of medieval erudition. The transformation of the temper of the Church could hardly be better illustrated than by a comparison of the correspondence of Nicolson with that of Warburton, and the latter prelate who had been bred in the Church of Gibson and Wake saw fit to castigate those divines who solaced themselves in "Monkish Owl Light." [1] The prejudices of men of sensibility which had once been subjected to the lively scorn of Elizabeth Elstob [2] flourished in a society which prided itself on disdaining the past, and

[1] Figgis, "William Warburton" in *Typical English Churchmen from Parker to Maurice.*

[2] Prefaces to *Rudiments of Grammar* (1715) and *English Saxon Homily* (1709). Cf. *Times Literary Supplement,* 28 Sept., 1933.

their sentiments were fittingly crystallised in the familiar phrases of Bolingbroke.

> To be ignorant about these ages which precede this æra—he remarked of the year A.D. 1500—would be shameful. Nay, some indulgence may be had to a temperate curiosity in the review of them. But to be learned about them is a ridiculous affectation in any man who means to be useful to the present age.[1]

Certainly a "temperate curiosity" was not the emotion which had driven the earlier scholars to their enduring achievement, and, equally certainly, this transformation in English intellectual taste produced a slackening in the momentum of medieval research. The only considerable contribution to Old English studies, for example, which was made during the mid-eighteenth century was Lye's *Dictionary*;[2] the progress of ecclesiastical research which had marked the Convocation Controversy ceased with its close;[3] and Hearne for nearly a hundred years found no worthy English successor as an editor of medieval chronicles.[4] Any division between epochs of learning must admit modifications. The opinions which were later to prove so deleterious to these studies were freely expressed in England long before the close of the seventeenth century, and in the years which followed the death of George I medieval research still found devoted adherents particularly in respect of local investigations. But, when all due allowances have been made, it remains hard to escape the conclusion that medieval scholarship in England underwent during the eighteenth century not a development but a reaction.

The seventy years subsequent to the Restoration, set as they were between a period of preparation and one of

[1] Bolingbroke, *Study of History* (Sixth Letter) in *Works* (1754), ii, p. 360.

[2] D. N. Smith, *Warton's History of English Poetry*, p. 8.

[3] Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures* (1900), p. 281.

[4] Specifically noted by Pinkerton in *Gentleman's Magazine* (1788) in connexion with the project sponsored by Gibbon for new editions of the chronicles of England. Cf. Gibbon, *Address Recommending Mr. Pinkerton* (*Misc. Works*, iii, p. 571).

decline, may probably be regarded as the golden age of English medieval scholarship. It still needs to be stated that this achievement was of the highest positive value, and that it can in no sense be regarded as an antiquated product of bygone enthusiasm. In their successful application of exact criticism to historical materials scholars like Wanley, Tanner and Madox differed from their best modern successors only in the immensity of their production. They were, moreover, outstanding members of a very numerous company, and their lesser contemporaries were worthy of being associated with them. Much of the erudition, thus laboriously accumulated, has become embedded in our present knowledge of medieval England. No student of Old English history can ignore his debt to Hickes, and no worthy investigator of ecclesiastical antiquities is likely to forget his obligation to Wake and to Wilkins. The work of Brady and of Phillips lives in our constitutional histories, and if modern editions have largely (though not entirely) supplanted the books of Wharton, Hearne, John Smith and Thomas Gale, their very excellence derives in part from the labours of the earlier scholars. It is seemly to recall these obligations, but there is here little reason for complacency. Our debt to these men is by no means exhausted, and their many and scattered volumes have, I venture to think, never received the full and the respectful attention they deserve. The very limited purpose of this paper will, at all events, have been achieved if I have recalled to your notice the value and the scope of this production, and if I have suggested that this pregnant movement of research ought now once again to be examined in its entirety. The time has perhaps arrived when English medieval scholarship may derive much benefit from a fresh study of its past progress in an age that was uniquely propitious to its growth.

THE IDEA OF A MERCANTILE STATE

By A. V. Judges, B.A., F.R.Hist.S.

Read 9 December, 1937

The chief purpose of this paper is to formulate a question. What, to put the matter briefly, have we in mind when we talk of the mercantile state ; and what functional value is possessed by our ideas about it when we are engaged in the processes of reconstructing the political and economic life of the centuries in which it is commonly believed to have flourished ? Various meanings have been given to the words *mercantile system* and also to the more austere *mercantilism* which German scholarship has coined for us to use when we wish to attempt a distillation of the policies attributed to practitioners of that system. Most of us would doubtless be ready to admit that these terms of art of the economist have been useful in bringing large groups of facts and theories into focus ; and therein lies their justification. But the concepts which they awkwardly try to express have had a steadily diminishing utility in recent years as our knowledge has advanced, and (like other premature generalisations in the history of ideas) it would seem that they are being perpetuated because we shrink from generalising anew.

One of the first things we require of a system is that it should be capable of systematic demonstration ; whilst an "ism" to be worthy of serious consideration must offer a coherent doctrine, or at least a handful of settled principles. In what measure can the mercantile system and mercantilism bear scrutiny when we approach them in this fashion ?

The truth seems to be that there was never a living

doctrine at all, nothing that can be compared with vital philosophies of action like physiocracy or liberalism or Marxism. Mercantilism never had a creed ; nor was there a priesthood dedicated to its service. Whilst some of the beliefs which its supposed philosophy is said to have subsumed were still widely and indeed vigorously upheld when the subject was first discovered to have independent reality, no one appears to have offered to defend its essentials or come forward to die fighting for the altar of the faith. The altar was really an affair of archæological reconstruction. First erected by men who fortified their attachments to their own faith by abusing the discredited and superstitious antics of their ancestors, it was later refashioned with many curious devices by the pious hands of those who wished to persuade themselves that current ideals could be sanctioned by the genius and wisdom of the past.

The discovery of the existence of a body of mercantile beliefs was made in the eighteenth century by men who found security for their own faith in a system of natural law. The bond of mutual sympathy among these observers was created far less by any similarity in their practical recommendations than by their common distrust of the current expedients of statecraft in Western Europe ; expedients which seemed designed with an almost cunning premeditation to hinder the maximisation of both happiness and productive capacity by setting up barriers to the economic self-expression of the individual citizen. Quesnay and his disciples the *économistes* in France and Smith in Britain were themselves creators of politico-economic theories claiming universal validity. It was perhaps only natural that they should seek to strengthen the outlines of their own proposals by systematising the theories which they discerned lurking behind the institutions that came under their fire. The dummy dragon they set up, articulated and endowed with organic functions by its indignant creators, had the fire of life breathed into it by the avenging angels themselves.

Of course, economic liberalism already had an interesting history before the American revolt and the birth of the *tableau économique*. But the critics of state interference had not hitherto stood sufficiently aloof from the regulative attitude of mind to see it as something essentially alien to their ideas. Non-interventionist policies had made their appearance in the works of pamphleteers from the early seventeenth century onwards. And one group of English writers, North, Child, Davenant and Barbon, supported by an indistinct fringe of even less consistent skirmishers, have been elevated to the position of a Tory school of free traders.[1] Pioneers they unquestionably were, and at times convincing free traders in their enunciation of principle. But Davenant and his fellows could be restrictionists of the extremest kind when it came to discussing specific proposals.[2] Gournay and Hume were both moderate protectionists, and if the former has been endowed by his admirer Turgot [3] with a creed of non-interventionism not improperly recognised by the traditional attribution to him of the incantation *Laissez faire, laissez passer*, the latter had an authoritarian bias, and was content to chastise, certainly with unsurpassed brilliance, a number of current " fallacies " and " species of ill-founded jealousy . . . prevalent among commercial nations." Dean Tucker, also, although one of the most devastating critics of unreason in an age dedicated to its converse, has one foot in an older camp. He says: " Abolish every tax and remove all impediments whatever which might prevent Self-Love—the Grand Mover—from operating for the public good " ; but he would tax the Grand Mover where it threatens to " decline from the great road of private virtue

[1] W. J. Ashley, " The Tory Origin of Free Trade Policy," *Q.J.E.*, July 1897, repr. in *Surveys Historic and Economic*, 1900, pp. 268 ff.

[2] " For one moment they reach an elevation from which they can contemplate the planet as a whole, and at the next moment their vision is confined to the horizon visible from an English shop window." Leslie Stephen, *Engl. Thought in the Eighteenth Century* (1902 edn.), vol. II, p. 297.

[3] " Éloge de Gournay " in *Œuvres de Turgot*, 1844, vol. I, pp. 262–91.

and public happiness." [1] His gospel of freedom is qualified by numerous cautionary provisos, and, indeed, he does not rank himself among the evangelists.

Our earliest introduction to the operative words is in 1763, in the *Philosophie Rurale* of Victor Riquetti, Marquis de Mirabeau, Quesnay's most excitable follower. " Absurd inconsistency of the mercantile system " (*système mercantile*), he writes in a marginal note.[2] The passage is an attack on the idea that a nation profits from the importation of money ; and on the same page he ridicules the approximation of the commercial policy of great empires to the standards of a counting-house in words that sound strikingly like a prophetic echo of Adam Smith's well-known invective upon " the sneaking arts of underling tradesmen." [3] Smith was admittedly not unfamiliar with the *Philosophie Rurale*.[4] Is this where he found the mercantile system patterned in the fashion he himself was to adopt ?

Smith and the later Physiocrats took up their position outside the habit of mind which they stigmatised as mercantile. For the latter, whose beliefs were based on the conviction that the real income of society was derived from the fields and quarries, the commercial, or regulative, or mercantile system was a sterile compost of the obsessions of merchants and industrialists. They summed it up as a preoccupation with national profit margins in the balance of trade.

For Smith the corpus of physiocratic doctrine was also an artificial system, only less objectionable than the mercantile system of the tradesmen because less in conflict with natural order. For every nostrum that strives by encouragements and restraints to force men in one occupation to employ at the expense of others a greater store of

[1] Josiah Tucker, *Elements of Commerce and Theory of Taxes*, Bristol, 1755, pp. 169–70.

[2] *Phil. Rurale, ou Écon. générale et politique de l'Agric.*, Amsterdam, 1763, p. 329.

[3] *Wealth of Nations*, ed. Cannan, 1904, I, p. 457.

[4] *Ibid.*, II, p. 177.

the capital of society than they would otherwise be entitled to, " retards instead of accelerating the progress of society towards real wealth and greatness." [1] His natural bias in favour of agriculture led him to treat the landowners' system of the physiocrats with a tempered sympathy and to curtail his criticism of their proposals. Did he not assert that the interests of the landowners were " strictly and inseparably connected with the general interests of society " ? [2] But if English political economy had come to regard commerce between nations as something which in the final analysis could be profitable to only one party, the French had proceeded to the discovery that it contributed to the wealth of neither. To Smith's mind it was evident that both must profit. The reason for his decision to devote the longest section of the *Wealth of Nations* to an examination of the mercantile system was that he saw it as a system in being—a reality of the contemporary world—which could be documented and assailed by reference to legislation and practice.

When the attack is opened at the beginning of Book IV, the mercantile system seems to have for Smith a fundamental unity of principle. What was this principle ? It was not, to be sure, that wealth consists solely in money, or in gold and silver, although this is " a popular notion " introduced to us in the first paragraph, a catch-phrase which even the best English writers had carelessly slipped into accepting in the course of debate.[3] Much of the subsequent discussion has unfortunately been led up a false path by the failure of commentators to observe that the appearance of the mercantile system is delayed until the sixth paragraph of the chapter in question.[4] Here it is announced as the reasoning of the merchants who in the seventeenth century rebelled against the attempts of governments to prohibit the international traffic in bullion. Their libertarian arguments

[1] *Ibid.*, II, p. 184. [2] *Ibid.*, I, p. 248. [3] *Ibid.*, I, pp. 396, 416.
[4] Cf. Edwin Cannan, *Review of Econ. Theory*, pp. 12–13, where the necessity for this qualification is brought out.

brought conviction to the authorities, at least in some countries, and the consequence was a lifting of restraints laid upon the export of gold and silver. To create conviction it was, however, necessary to appeal to current prejudices. Thomas Mun and the other tractarians of the commercial school accordingly justified their plea for the extension of foreign trade (for which they had their proper motives) by showing that, suitably managed, commerce with other nations enriched the country. The scientific study of the bases of national prosperity was not of course a matter upon which they had a specialist's claim to offer opinions, but, as they were in possession of the platform, it was not unnatural that merchants should claim that they were the principal benefactors. *England's Treasure by Forraign Trade*, the title of Mun's second and posthumous contribution to political economy, published in 1664, could be accepted as the slogan of this school of commercial expansion. Out of this literature arose the calculus of the balance of trade,[1] a touchstone of principle which was to determine what forms of exchange might be encouraged as tending to yield a net balance in treasure and what forms should be discouraged on account of the drain of precious metal they set in motion.

Smith was not greatly concerned, I believe, to discover whether or not the equation *money equals wealth*—the popular maxim to which most of his predecessors had paid occasional lip-service—was a vital ingredient in the "system". It is rather the consequences of the deplorable behaviour of legislators clumsily trying to execute the injunctions of the balance theorists by means of tariffs, prohibitions, drawbacks, bounties and commercial monopolies, that provokes him to the fullest use of his analytical skill and deflating satire. Except in his reflections on the marketing of corn, he is careful to exclude by implication

[1] Actually this theorem of the general balance was already hoary with age. We meet it in English tracts and official memoranda at least a century earlier.

a large range of internal restrictions from the operations of mercantile statecraft. But in almost every field he saw very clearly that public interference was wasteful and corrupt, prodigal above all of administrative effort.[1] This helps to explain his exaggeration of the malignancy and power of gild control [2] in the corporate towns and his distrust of joint-stock enterprise with its tradition of privilege and licensed incompetence. The conclusions which he had previously reached in his Edinburgh lectures by a process of *a priori* reasoning starting from the principle of Natural Liberty, he now re-established with a great wealth of inductive argument supported by wide historical reading and empirical experience of the problems of administration.[3] The effect was overwhelming.

As with the economic writings of Bentham,[4] we are left with a picture of the waste and inefficiency of most forms of public interference as then practised, but not with the sense that the State direction of human affairs is by definition nugatory. Indeed, whoever attempts the instructive task of culling from the works of Adam Smith a list of what Bentham would call the proper *agenda* of public authority must be surprised by the amplitude of his reservations to any thorough-going notion of a *laissez-faire* policy, even within the field of overseas trade.

For many years the study of economic thought as an historical phenomenon was allowed to drop. Further investigations on the lines of those conducted by Dr. Redford and his group of Manchester workers on the activities of the

[1] Cf. E. Halévy, *Growth of Philosophical Radicalism*, p. 104, etc.

[2] Arnold Toynbee supposed that Smith was influenced by the gild restrictionism of Glasgow, where James Watt tried to set up as a craftsman (*Lectures on the Ind. Revolution of the 18th Century*, 1925 impr., p. 52). The picturesque legend of Watt's persecution by the hammermen seems now to have received its death-blow (H. W. Dickinson, *James Watt, Craftsman and Engineer*, 1937, pp. 25–6).

[3] Cf. W. R. Scott, *Adam Smith as Student and Philosopher*, pp. 124–5.

[4] *Manual of Pol. Econ.*, chap. 3; *Observations on the Restrictive and Prohibitory Commercial System* (first pr. 1821), section 2; John Bowring, *Works of Jeremy Bentham*, 1843, vol. III.

organisations of the commercial and industrial interests may show that the more thoughtful of the manufacturers who led the campaign for a more open trade and helped to promote the Eden Treaty of 1786 had some breadth of vision on economic policy as a whole. But their liberalism seems at best half-hearted. They could oppose a revenue excise on pig iron, plead for fewer restrictions on trade with the Continent, whilst using all their lobbying resources to wreck a commercial treaty with Ireland. And like the first movement for political reform, the early free-trade campaign was stifled in the dark days of the Revolutionary Wars. The two movements moreover came to be inextricably mixed, for the revised corn laws now occupied the foremost place in the schedule of interference measures; and the support of the landlords was still essential to politicians.

Nevertheless, when the smoke begins to clear away, the initiative in liberal reform seems to be with the statesmen, supported with no great enthusiasm by city merchants and bankers, and with the group of active intellectuals who are to become known to us as the Classical Economists. According to Newmarch, the year 1820 which witnessed the presentation by Alexander Baring of the Merchants' Petition in the Commons also saw "the system of prohibition, protection and fiscal confusion at its height." [1]

At about this point the tide turns. In reality, of system there was none. As we watch reformers at work and listen to the arguments offered by those who defend restrictive laws, it becomes evident that the policies now standing their trial are but little concerned with the retention of a favourable balance of trade or any group of related propositions. They are concerned almost entirely with the protection of sheltered trades, the defence of shipping monopolies and the profits of agriculture—a fine miscellany of vested interests.

The administrative chaos in which creative architects

[1] Tooke and Newmarch, *Hist. of Prices*, 1857, vol. V, p. 400.

like Huskisson and Senior, using simple mechanical formulæ, tried to build, or at least remodel, was a combination of survivals inherited from different strata of time and temperament. Some things, like the Navigation Laws and the rules of the Statute of Artificers, were heritages of policy. Others, perhaps the more formidable obstacles, were heritages of expediency, and consisted for the most part of customs schedules and fiscal regulations originally devised by eighteenth-century legislators for nothing more socially significant than security for public loans. Huskisson and Peel and Gladstone liquidated a commercial system which may be described far less correctly as a protectionist order than as a latter-day revision of a revenue system of unfathomable complexity balanced on the inadequate foundation of a tonnage and poundage law which had been devised for the traffic conditions of the fifteenth century. It was, in fact, a piecemeal system of which many parts had ceased to pay even for their keep.

The exponents of economic liberalism felt called upon to destroy an economic regime ; but it was a regime lacking order and a coherent philosophy. In its place they offered a plan of an ordered society, a *Planwirtschaft*, which must surely possess more of the attributes of an economic and social " system " than we can discern in the policy fashioned by their predecessors. Far from being satisfied with expedients, they allowed their ideas to play upon a projected social structure exhibited in complete diagrammatic form. The proposed functions of their State fell into an orderly pattern, a scheme of property, inheritance, contractual relationships and regulated currency, so devised that sellers of goods and services might find unhindered self-expression ; they made provision for a rigidly fenced enclosure within which business men, workpeople and the investing public could play at being free.

The notion presupposed an organised institutional policy and a political programme : the rule of non-intervention must be established by the creation of a new set of institu-

tions, of which the simplified working model in the mind of Ricardo was the conventional framework of the market in which he gained his experience of man's behaviour, namely the London Stock Exchange. The function of the State was to keep the ring so that production and exchange might operate freely on principles of their own through the instrumentality of human beings whose individual power and influence upon the market were infinitesimally small. Monopolistic and privileged forces should be excluded by public action. The liberal reform movement was this action. The utilitarian wing were convinced that social efficiency under the new dispensation demanded incursions into living conditions, and even called for mediatised institutions to bring influence to bear upon conditions of employment; and it has been well observed that "no sooner had the Benthamites given a man freedom to choose his own church and his own market than they took away his freedom to dispose of his own sewage." [1]

To discover another such rule of principle and rules for its adoption we must go back to the school of Aquinas and the canonist lawyers. The stretch of time between these reigns of coherent social policy seems like a vast interim full of unco-ordinated specifics. Professor Heckscher has recently drawn attention in convincing fashion to the agreement between *laissez-faire* theories and the notions of the pre-classical age, inasmuch as they were at one in accepting the postulate that individual self-interest supplied the motive power which drove production and exchange. To that extent both were mechanistic: superhuman agencies were repudiated. If anything, it may be suggested that the "mercantilist" outlook on the economic scene was metaphysical to an even less degree than the later one. The Heaven-ordained laws of Supply and Demand hardly appeared as the outcome of a special creation until the evangelical movement had given full thought to social questions. Had the earlier economists conceived of an

[1] D. C. Somervell, *The Victorian Age*, p. 24.

Invisible Hand lightly playing over the operations of the free exchange of goods and services they would certainly have questioned its benevolent intentions. "Trade indeed will find its own Channels," wrote Sir Francis Brewster in 1702, deploring the luxury traffic's superior attractions for capital as compared with the fisheries, "but it will be to the ruin of our Nation, if not Regulated." [1]

In the works of the masters of the classical period there is little evidence of acquaintance with the principles which might be said to underlie a regulated or mercantile economy. Some of them were too busy focusing attention upon the lack of reason and goodwill displayed by sectional interests and groups—the landed interest which "dominated the unreformed Parliament, restricted the mobility of labour by parish settlement and the Speenhamland system, and maintained the Corn Laws for the protection of corn prices and land-rents"; [2] and the unproductive habits of all those who spent but did not produce.

Detached arguments in support of state restrictionism of course received much attention and criticism. The doctrine of comparative costs, if it was not at this time a complete novelty in economic literature,[3] was more strictly formulated to give theoretical justification to the attack on tariffs and prohibitions. It could offer another way of looking at gains and losses. The old balance of trade theories received attention in so far as they impeded appreciation of revised ideas on monetary distribution and international prices. And although money moved in the forefront of discussion, its relevance to the fundamental relationships between productive factors (now the main consideration in the theory of wealth creation) became entirely subsidiary. This may be seen most clearly in the

[1] *New Essays on Trade*, p. 61.

[2] M. Dobb, *Pol. Econ. and Capitalism*, p. 50.

[3] As J. Viner points out (*Studies in the Theory of International Trade*, p. 440), the anonymous author of the very remarkable *Considerations on the E. India Trade*, 1701, states what is essentially the doctrine in rather different terms from those employed by Ricardo.

attacks launched on the seventeenth and eighteenth-century arguments which linked up the rate of interest with the supply of money for investment. And it is symptomatic of present-day tendencies that the watchword of Mr. Maynard Keynes's latest contribution to the theories of money and employment is Back to the Mercantilists, by way of reaction to Ricardo and his English successors.[1] In combating the notion that money was wealth this group of writers is usually content to explain that the heresy must have arisen as a result of the necessity of evaluating commodity relationships in terms of cash. As J. B. Say put it,

> They have taken the means for the end. The money which they receive only for the purpose of spending is confounded with the product they propose to consume ; as might happen if men, seeing that it was necessary to go through a door to enter a house, and failing to bother at all about the desirability of the house such as other men experience, proceeded to tell one : have doors, and you will always have houses.[2]

Malthus, Ricardo, James Mill and Torrens have no constructive analysis to offer of pre-Smithian thought and policy. But Nassau Senior in his Oxford lectures in 1827 devoted part of his time to an examination of the mercantile system, " which at present clogs all our actions and disturbs all our reasonings." He discussed its monetary aspects at some length in tones of shocked disapproval, summed up

[1] Believing that statesmen aimed at a high equilibrium level of investment and employment, " there was wisdom," Mr. Keynes holds, " in their intense preoccupation with keeping down the rate of interest by means of usury laws . . ., by maintaining the domestic stock of money and by discouraging rises in the wage-unit ; and in their readiness in the last resort to restore the stock of money by devaluation, if it had become plainly deficient through an unavoidable foreign drain, a rise in the wage-unit, or any other cause " (*General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, chap. 23). Without finding myself in a position to endorse much of Mr. Keynes's interpretation of English economic theory of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, I do think he succeeds, in passages similar in perspicacity to the quotation above, in illuminating some of the *ends* of monetary policy in those times, ends which have been persistently misunderstood by critics who found altogether too facile an aid to destructive analysis in J. S. Mill's exposition of the theory of international trade.

[2] J. B. Say, *Cours Complet d'Écon. Politique* (1852 edn.) II, pp. 205–6.

the commercial restrictions as having been contrived to produce individual gain at the cost of the common loss, remarking that public opinion noticed only the concentration of gain and seemed unaware of the diffusion of the loss. Unless I am mistaken, this was the first broadside assault on the "system" since the *Wealth of Nations*, and it is important for our purpose because Senior passed from the balance-of-trade policies to some reflections on national jealousies and the manifest aim of mercantile policy to be independent of foreign commodities. This leads to the destruction of the mutual security of nations, to say nothing of privation at home. "The half-naked subjects of Caractacus were doubtless independent of foreign supplies, and so is the semi-barbarian who burrows in the ruins of Persepolis, and gathers his dates among the ruins of palaces." [1]

Autarchy, or self-sufficiency for purposes of defence, had now been brought in to widen the supposed objects of mercantile policy.

John Stuart Mill, who constituted himself the *rapporteur* of the deliberations of the English classical economists, was more strictly in the orthodox Adam Smith tradition. But he displayed no historical understanding. The mercantile system, with its obsessions about the precious metals, "looks like one of the crude fancies of childhood. . . . Once questioned indeed, it was doomed." Yet the reasoning was not unnatural among minds which "had not yet become familiar with certain modes of stating and of contemplating economical phenomena." He marvelled that in Australia "the exploded fallacies of the mercantile system are revived with a simple ignorance of all that has been written and proved against them." [2]

Cairnes somewhat later distinguished the system of protection from the system of the balance of trade, the

[1] Nassau Senior, *Three Lectures on the Transmission of the Precious Metals* (2nd edn.), pp. 39, 45–51, 95.

[2] J. S. Mill, *Principles*, Preliminary Remarks; *Letters*, ed. H. S. R. Elliott, II, pp. 154–5.

former taking the place of the latter in historical sequence, " to underpin the tottering edifice." In this process native industry was substituted for the precious metals as the cause of riches ; but these were different aspects of the same system, and commercial problems were still viewed in the same way.[1]

The dissemination of thought about the system was largely, however, the work of the camp-followers and vulgarisers among the economists. J. R. McCulloch appears to have been the writer principally responsible for the spreading of the crude notion that the essential doctrine of the mercantile system was the identification of money with wealth.[2] An omnivorous but careless student of early economic works, he declared this to be the core of the old policy of restriction ; but it was not all, for the mercantile writers actually secured the ascendancy of their commercial policy by a system of industrial regulation inherited from the medieval towns. This was a point which may have been suggested to him by a discourse by Francesco Mengotti called *Il Colbertismo*, published in Florence in 1792. In McCulloch's hands the theory had become narrower, the scope of its application somewhat wider.[3] McCulloch edited, and provided an historical introduction for, the most popular edition of the *Wealth of Nations* that circulated in early-Victorian England. Buckle, Macaulay, Lecky and a not inconsiderable number of less influential writers took their history of political economy from him. Any residual qualifications to a very bald and unhistorical interpretation fell to the ground in the process of transference.

[1] J. E. Cairnes, *Some Leading Principles of Pol. Econ. newly expounded*, 1874, p. 450.

[2] " The supporters of the mercantile system like their predecessors held that gold and silver alone constituted wealth." *Principles* (4th edn.), 1849, p. 30 ; cf. also *Literature of Pol. Econ.*, *passim*, and Introductory Discourse prefacing McCulloch's editions of *Wealth of Nations*.

[3] Mengotti's Colbertism is divisible into two parts, the first the system of the balance of trade, the second the regulation of industry. See Custodi, *Scrittori Classici Italiani di Economia Politica*, 1804, Parte Moderna, tomo XXXVI, pp. 251 ff.

Only one other name in the purely English tradition calls for special mention. Leslie Stephen, whose *English Thought in the Eighteenth Century* was published in 1876, knew his literature as few others had done; but on its economic side his reading was not wide. Even so he was one of the first to realise that after the Restoration the discussion of money balances was giving place to considerations of stored-up labour, and that the main preoccupation of publicists from the English Revolution onwards was with employment and poor-law problems, not with the manipulation of specie payments. But this is anticipating a later trend of observation; and it is time to go back to a very different method of approach, which may be described as the *generalised* view of the mercantile system in distinction from the *restricted* view of the English classical school.

The English economists, who never went far beyond the conception for which Adam Smith takes credit as chief inventor, viewed the mercantile system as an agglomeration of commercial interferences fortified by a monetary fallacy which was itself based upon a misunderstanding of the real nature of international exchange. The approach was highly unsympathetic, the treatment limited as to period and range. It was not until Bagehot and Cliffe Leslie protested against the claims of universality which had been advanced for the abstract political economy of a highly capitalised and competitive society that English thought became infected with the idea that "unorthodox" policies might have been living necessities for economic communities in their backward days. Cliffe Leslie even suggested that the classical definitions of wealth—mere abstractions as they looked to him—originated in opposition to the doctrines "erroneously imputed to the mercantile School," and were no more than negative statements.[1]

Germany was the proper nursery of the generalised view

[1] Cliffe Leslie, *Essays in Pol. and Moral Phil.*, 1879, pp. 219–20, etc.; W. Bagehot, *Econ. Studies*, 1880, pp. 16–20.

of the mercantile state ; but the birth appears to have been foreshadowed, if it did not actually occur, in the theatre of the newly founded King's College in the Strand in 1833, when Richard Jones launched the study of political economy there in an inaugural lecture. Jones developed his ideas about the relative nature of economic doctrines elsewhere. On this occasion [1] he was content to describe the inception and practice of bullionist restrictions in their fourteenth-century historical setting and later, and to suggest that monetary policy had proceeded by stages. Beginning with the balance-of-bargain system—the expression was Jones's invention—which demanded that imports and exports should be forced to balance in the transactions of individual merchants, and necessitated staples, statutes of employment and royal exchangers to secure enforcement, policy underwent a change within the expansive years 1558–1660. Legislators then revised their notions of policy and went over to the balance-of-trade system, which sought only a general balance on the aggregate trade of the country.[2]

Relativity and evolutionary stages were part of the methodological equipment of *Historismus*. This is not a proper place to discuss the general philosophical position of the German historical school. But we may remind ourselves that the school assumed its relativist character by transferring to the economic sphere the arguments relating to the history of legal institutions which had been used by

[1] " Primitive Pol. Econ. in England," *Edin. Rev.*, April 1847, pp. 426 ff., repr. in R. Jones's *Lit. Remains*, ed. Whewell, 1859, pp. 293 ff.

[2] Travers Twiss devoted his admirable course of Oxford lectures in 1846–7 (*View of Progress of Pol. Econ.*, 1847) to the early development of economic ideas, and accepted the generally held view that the mercantile system came in with Mun. Twiss seems not to have been influenced at all by Jones, but he makes acknowledgment to Adolphe Blanqui's important *Hist. de l'Écon. Politique* (first publ. 1838), though disagreeing with him on certain matters, e.g., the claims of Mun's contemporary Antonio Serra to be considered a liberal thinker. On the comparative importance as pioneers of Mun and Serra see Marx at his most playfully sarcastic in chapter 10 contributed to part II of Engels' *Anti-Dühring*.

Savigny, coloured as they were by the stress he put upon national idiosyncrasies ; that it inherited some of the traditions of political and academic cameralism with its faith in the conditioning functions of the state in economic life ; and that it was strongly influenced by recent German idealist philosophy. It is also important to remember that the nexus between money and the production of wealth had been given an insignificant place in the economic literature of central Europe. Oncken has stated that he met the statement " Money is Wealth " only once in his wide acquaintance with German economic writings.[1]

Fichte, the spiritual father of the modern totalitarian state, had reacted against the internationalism of Smith, and desired to safeguard the rule of natural law within a fenced-in territorial enclosure closed against the marauding incursions of flag-waving bagmen. But the full revolt against Manchester liberalism was delayed until List had made out his—journalistically effective—case for the tariff protection of industrial economies in an immature stage of development, and until Roscher and Knies had demonstrated the necessity for studying economic concepts and rules of action as products of the time and circumstances wherein they arose. Economics in the hands of their followers was no abstract science, but the study of the laws of evolution stage by stage as exhibited in the life of nations. It has sometimes been said that members of the school were not economists at all, but historians or sociologists ; and there is just enough truth in this to explain Menger's complaint that " the historians have stepped upon the territory of our science like foreign conquerors, in order to force upon us their language and their customs, their terminology and their methods." [2] Intolerance, not to say malignity, was displayed on both sides when the great struggle opened in the 'seventies between the respective supporters of the

[1] Palgrave, *Dict. of Pol. Econ.*, 1910, II, p. 198 n.

[2] *Die Irrthümer des Historismus*, preface, quoted J. N. Keynes, *Scope and Method*, 1891, p. 306.

inductive and deductive methods. The younger historical school was forced into an untenable position. Little of what it endeavoured to contribute to economic theory has stood the test of time ; but its services to history have had more enduring value, if only for its examination of the springs of political action.

The mercantile state naturally received close attention. In this atmosphere the proper course was not to explode its reputed fallacies but to explain its reality as a stage in the growth of society. Features of bygone economic policy which would have been dismissed elsewhere as irrelevant to the discussion were investigated with loving care as examples of paternalist mercantile strategy. For Roscher a system which had lasted for centuries could not be wholly erroneous, and was worthy of examination. It struck him, for example, that an immensely significant feature of benevolent despotism, and of early economic discussion generally, was the insistence, whether for agricultural, industrial or military reasons, on adequate measures for encouraging population growth. Hildebrand and Bücher developed, though in different fashion, the idea of stages in economic progress from the primitive to the complex. In the latter's judgment the State was compelled by historical necessity to employ measures of guidance in nursing the community through the critical transition from town economy to national economy, until liberalism could at length be given rein for *its* formative career. Not infrequently the state, in the drive towards the goal, manipulated its material into forms unduly artificial. But " the theory of the balance of trade became a necessity when the transition [towards a commercial economy] indispensably postulated the increase of the monetary medium of circulation." [1] Professor Sombart has more recently followed up this idea, using a different framework of stages, in his treatment of mercantilism as the political economy of early capitalism.

[1] Karl Bücher, *Die Entstehung der Volkswirtschaft*, first publ. 1893, Engl. transl., 1901, pp. 136 ff.

It was left for Gustav Schmoller to create a synthetic picture of mercantilism in rounding off the work of his predecessors. This he accomplished using a remarkably deep intuition of the forces underlying public policy in combination with a strong sense of the transcendence of the human will in a world where systematic laws of economic life were only valid on a superficial reckoning. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that he formed his notion of mercantile policy on the study of the struggle for unification and national self-expression guided by the electors and kings of Prussia. As a process of State-building it was concerned as much to provide for the fluidity of resources and products within the country by the removal of tolls,[1] local privileges and currency defects, as to compel the respect of the country's neighbours by a spirited economic policy along and beyond the frontiers. It advocated free-trade or prohibition principles according to the circumstances of the case ; and not only according to concrete conditions, but according to the goal towards which the country was striving. The state was a formative agent ; it gave existence to organised society ; and both political and economic life were forces to be regulated by the government. " The mercantilist ideal was not only the legitimate ideal for those centuries but the only proper end. And the ends aimed at have not yet completely lost their legitimacy," he wrote in 1900.[2] Only a firm and enlightened central authority could co-ordinate the necessary measures for the creation of a national economy (*Volkswirtschaft*) out of anarchy. Such a conviction led him to the somewhat startling conclusion that the economic decline of the Netherlands was caused by the

[1] The careful investigation since made by E. Rachel in the *Acta Borussica* shows, however, that in the case of Germany, where Schmoller's *liberating* mercantile policy is supposed to find its clearest expression, the unification of the tolls was the last thing the territorial princes were able to secure. See Heckscher (*Mercantilism*, I, pp. 56 ff.) for a shattering treatment of the myth.

[2] *Grundriss der Allgemeinen Volkswirtschaftslehre*. Erster Teil, 1900, s. 86.

exclusion from public life of the House of Orange in the Stadtholderless period, 1650–72.[1]

Much proceeds from Schmoller's prime assumption that state agencies were more effective in pushing trade and capturing fields of enterprise than the unhampered activity of private traders could have been. But it is idle to seek to discover from the wealth of apparently conflicting examples offered in his writings whether mercantilism favoured the use of economic means to serve the ends of national greatness, or the use of political means to achieve successes in the industrial and commercial spheres. There is no fundamental distinction to be drawn between the kinds of means employed by the purposeful and ruthless state authority. The Western powers traded with their rivals while at war with them, and fought them with prohibitions and Navigation Acts while nominally at peace.

> The heroic struggle of the Dutch for religious freedom . . . displays itself . . . as a century-long war for the conquest of the East Indian colonies, and the equally long privateering assault on the silver fleets of Spain and the Spanish-American colonial trade. . . . Even the expedition of Gustavus Adolphus to Germany was a move in the game which was being played for the trade of the Baltic.[2]

Schmoller's range of illustration seems to permit no aspect of state activity within a span of centuries to escape the comprehensiveness of his definition. Even the balance-of-trade policies have their place, although " the whole idea and doctrine of the balance of trade . . . was only the secondary consequence of a conception of economic processes which grouped them according to States." [3]

In 1868 at the age of nineteen William Cunningham went to continue his university studies in Germany. That he chose to go to Tübingen, Schmoller's old university, is no more

[1] " Studien über die Wirtschaftliche Politik Fr. des Grossen und Preussens," in 7 parts in *Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, usw.*, 1884. Transl. in part as *The Mercantile System and its Historical Significance*, N.Y., 1931, p. 53.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 64–5.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 61.

than a coincidence. That he came home profoundly influenced by German conceptions of the state and German notions of order and discipline is a fact which has a bearing on his intellectual progress.[1] Fourteen years later *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce* made its first and, one might say, embryonic appearance, in a single volume. The progress of this remarkable book through its successive editions is in a very real sense a measure of the advance of economic history in England in Cunningham's working lifetime. It was obvious from the beginning that the title was a misnomer. The book was a study of the rise of authoritarianism and its decline, and "the fruitfulness . . . of this field of study . . . had to be demonstrated," as Professor Scott has pointed out, "in the face of the traditions of the Classical School."[2] When the 1892 edition appeared it was made the object of a vigorous attack by W. A. S. Hewins, who was in a few years to become the first Director of the London School of Economics. Hewins was shocked by Cunningham's indiscriminate praise for regulative measures. To call the Corn Bounty Act of 1689 "a masterly stroke of policy" which proved itself to be the corner-stone of English prosperity in the eighteenth century, was, he thought, not so much excessive as wrong-headed. For Cunningham, he suggested, the *pursuit of national power* performed the same functions as prime mover in the seventeenth century as *desire of wealth* did in the nineteenth. He paraphrased Cunningham unkindly but not untruly in a *pastiche* which must have stung his victim:

> The mercantile system is concerned with man only as a being who pursues national power, and who is capable of judging of the comparative efficacy of means to that end. It makes entire abstraction of every other human passion or motive, except those which may be regarded as perpetually antagonising principles to the pursuit of national power—viz., neglect of shipping and aversion to a fish diet.[3]

[1] W. R. Scott, *William Cunningham, 1849–1919*, British Academy *Proceedings*, vol. IX; p. 3 of reprint.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[3] *Econ. Journal*, 1892, II, pp. 694 ff.

Cunningham's rejoinder was not very effective; but he stuck to his belief in the Corn Bounty Act and the fish diet.[1] Already he was interested in projects for the reconstruction of commercial policy.[2] The South African War and Chamberlain's Tariff Reform proposals swept him on to the public platform, as they swept Hewins himself into the Tariff Commission, as an advocate of imperial preference.[3] The third edition of the *Modern Times* section of the History appeared in 1903 with a startling epilogue. *Laissez-faire* had been a manifest failure. How could a directed national policy repair the damage? The postscript was in reality a protectionist tract, tricked out with historical parallels. Bismarck's socialism from above, for instance, is seen to bear a curious resemblance to the work of the early Stuart Council.[4] The tone of this polemic was modified in subsequent editions; but Cunningham's affection for the alleged mercantilist policy of Burleigh—who "was wonderfully successful in reducing the waste which had come to be so generally current in the fifteenth century"[5]—his belief that the essential policy of common or "general interest" in the old Colonial System was right, even his suspicion that the genuine spirit of regulative control had been thwarted by the growth of democratic institutions during the period which he oddly described as the era of Parliamentary Colbertism—these convictions remained until the end.

Cunningham had indeed developed the generalised view of mercantilism in a more convincing fashion than had any other writer or teacher. His was perhaps a more satisfying exposition than the German attempts because it was inspired in the main by the institutional life-story of a single well-

[1] *Econ. Journal*, 1894, IV, pp. 512 ff.; and cf. *Richard Cobden and Adam Smith*, publ. by Tariff Reform League, 1904, pp. 29–30.

[2] *Modern Civilization in its Econ. Aspects*, 1896.

[3] W. A. S. Hewins, *The Apologia of an Imperialist*, vol. I, chaps. 2 and 3.

[4] *Growth of Engl. Industry and Commerce in Mod. Times*, 1903, p. 879.

[5] *Progress of Capitalism in England*, 1916, p. 83.

knit community. English examples of the operation of the unifying principles came too early, or were too limited, to distract attention seriously from the great topics of naval efficiency and imperial solidarity which run as coloured threads through his examination of the growth of national policy; yet industrial and social control receive adequate attention as expressions of mercantile trends.

The influence of this great teacher has been such that students of history have experienced no little difficulty in preserving appreciation for whatever may be the merits of the restricted view. Sir William Ashley was more cautious than Cunningham, but he was under the spell of *Historismus* with its love of stages and time sequences. Even the title of his most important historical work, *An Introduction to English Economic History and Theory*, displays a challenge. George Unwin, who took a different side in the South African War controversy, brought a mind of tougher fibre than Cunningham's to bear on the history of paternalist regulation, and found it wanting in sincerity and effectiveness. He emphasised "the tendency to over-estimate the active part which wise forethought and the deliberate pursuit of clear ideas has played in the economic history of nations," at the same time admitting that positive interference measures had shaped the course of events in a very definite and sometimes disastrous fashion. "It is an undoubted fact, says Voltaire somewhere, that spells and incantations are capable of destroying whole flocks of sheep, if accompanied by sufficient quantities of arsenic." This saying had always appeared to Unwin "to afford a suggestive introduction to the study of the influence of ideas, of theory, upon economic development." [1] We may approve or disapprove of his scepticism; we may hold that he even exaggerated the influence of thought upon policy; it can hardly be conceded that he gave sharper definition to the idea of the mercantile state.

The responsibility for questioning the propriety of the

[1] *Studies in Econ. Hist.*, p. 158.

generalised description has been lightly assumed by one or two economists in this country and America; but our monographs and textbooks in economic history are still vaguely comprehensive in their use of terms; and it may be that the reluctance of writers to overhaul their terminological equipment has been to some extent justified by certain considerations arising out of the fuller examination of pre-Smithian economic writings which has been in progress during the last few years. Professor Heckscher of Stockholm, in what will doubtless establish itself as the classic exposition of the thought and policy of the period of early capitalism in Europe, has produced an eclectic survey of the manifold tendencies of that age.[1] His masterly analysis of conflicting trends brings out certain common assumptions which may have caused statesmen to close their eyes to the often fundamental divergence of interest existing among consumers, producers and distributing agencies, so that they allowed themselves to be dominated now by "love of goods," now by "fear of goods"; now by the glamour of bullion, now by the magical appeal of paper-money inflation. But when all has been said I think the highest common factor in the harvest of notions and policies brought to the surface by Professor Heckscher's efficient trawl can be no more than this: a belief in official intervention as a corrective to evils which must arise from the neglect of public interest in the actions of individuals and of institutions subordinate to the political authority. And the political authority wanted unity and wanted power; not, surely, exceptional ends in the history of human programmes!

It is proper, however, to insist on the book's positive contributions to the study of the subject. Only one can be mentioned here. In demonstrating that the theory of

[1] *Mercantilism*; first published in Swedish in 1931; the English version, with author's revisions, in 1935. Professor Heckscher has summarised his views in an article of the same title in *Econ. Hist. Rev.*, Nov. 1936, pp. 44 ff.

money looked upon currency from two points of view Professor Heckscher has cleared the field for a more systematic approach. It was no longer necessary to elevate bullion to a special position as a store of value, and to some extent as a factor of production, when credit instruments and bank money began to show their ability to function in place of gold and silver. The balance-of-trade concepts of Misselden and Serra were no longer deadly instruments in eighteenth-century controversy. But the consideration of circulating money, money as a means of exchange and as a price-determinant, whatever might be its material composition, was almost as lively an issue as it came to be later on in the bullion debates. The control of the rate of interest and the lowering of the price of labour were now the practical questions. Such things did prompt theoretical analysis. On the one hand rising prices signified the ability to clear stocks, increase sales, raise rents ; on the other, the reduction of the cost of productive agents, especially labour, would allow the country to force manufactured goods on its neighbours. Under suitable control conditions a favourable trading balance was ardently to be desired because it might be held to indicate the sending out of embodied labour effort—an artificial and, so to speak, gratuitous product—in exchange for the indestructible material on which the circulating media could be still further expanded—or often just for the satisfaction of keeping people at work. The full employment of labour was desired for many reasons. It is worth recalling, for example, that from the end of Elizabeth's reign the cost of poor relief in this country fell on the ratepayers. And a careful examination of the arguments relating to production for export used in Great Britain from the Restoration onwards has suggested to more than one investigator—I have in mind Professor Viner of Chicago and Dr. E. A. J. Johnson of Cornell in particular [1]

[1] J. Viner, *Studies in the Theory of International Trade*, pp. 51–7 ; E. A. J. Johnson, *Predecessors of Adam Smith*, pt. III ; cf. also E. S. Furniss, *Position of the Laborer in a System of Nationalism*.

—a new variant of the restricted view of mercantilism ; the balance of trade being conceived in terms, not of gold and silver, but of the number of labourers, or units of labour, applied to the commodities exchanged in international trade. The policy, of course, aimed at an *excess* of such exports of realised labour.

So we have to add to our accumulated stock a fresh body of interpretation—an important and acceptable increment, it is true ; but is the subject of our discussion not becoming somewhat embarrassingly miscellaneous ? Are we prepared to allow that every act of authority involving interference displayed some element of the true tradition of the mercantilist spirit ? There are indications that at any moment we may be confronted with an attempt to resurrect and pin down in a display cabinet the mercantilist theory of the disposition of capital resources at home and abroad. How, if I may pose one conundrum, ought one to regard the Bubble Act of 1720 ? Was this a mercantilist measure ? It threatened with all the penalties of præmunire the promoters of any association of investors which had shares offered for public subscription, unless, that is, a charter could be produced. It was restrictive, certainly ; paternalist in its intention to protect the ignorant investor ; and it may be held to have interfered seriously with the free employment of the accumulated capital of several generations. But might it not be treated as an anti-mercantilist gesture ? It foreshadowed the ultimate doom of the great licensed monopolies. Was it not, moreover, a vindication of the principle of private enterprise ? " Trade seldom requires the aid of such combinations," roundly asserted the Attorney-General in 1761, " but thrives better when left open to the free speculations of private men." [1] How does the Act work into Adam Smith's treatment of corporations ? What would Schmoller have made of it ? Finally, what do its consequences mean when treated as far as possible on their own merits—divorced from early Stuart patent procedure

[1] B. C. Hunt, *Development of Business Corporations*, p. 11.

on the one hand, and the principles of nineteenth-century company law on the other ?

Any programme of limited investigation into the phenomena of policy must proceed by employing the well-known methods of inductive inquiry until the material is isolated and built into some sort of pattern. At every stage the testing and application of general ideas must, of course, go on, whether the interpretation deals with the monetary, or the labour, or the capital, or the land, or the governmental, or any other aspect of policy. Must the idea, or rather complex of ideas, of the mercantile state necessarily be forced into the process until it dominates the whole structure of the finished work ? In this respect, at least, the critics among the economists of current historical method seem to be mistaken. We ought perhaps to set out with a better equipment of theoretical concepts ; but there is one little group of postulates we could well dispense with.

The plea I wish to advance is that we should now consider ourselves absolved from the necessity of having to reconcile the conclusions derived from detailed researches into the antecedents and effects of edicts, statutes and municipal by-laws, spread over the whole European and colonial field within a period of more than three centuries,[1]

[1] When did mercantilism flourish ? Most, though not all, of our authorities allow it an exclusively post-medieval career. It is commonly believed that it passed through several stages, among which " bullionism " sometimes appears as a sort of curtain-raiser to the " general-balance " act. Arnold Toynbee (*op. cit.*, p. 56) taught that the mercantile system came to an end at the point in time at which Adam Smith seems to have made it begin. Luigi Cossa, a representative stratifier, distinguished three phases : (*a*) specie regulation and exchange control ; (*b*) originating " in the last centuries of the Middle Ages," a " balance-of-bargains " calculus ; (*c*) the era of the balance-of-trade proper (*Introd. to the Study of Pol. Economy*, Engl. transl., 1893, Historical Part, chap. 4). Sir William Holdsworth (*Hist. of Engl. Law*, XI, p. 380) restricts the period to the eighteenth century. The notions of the Whigs, triumphing over the commercial liberalism of the Tory peace of Utrecht, " gave rise to the economic system which is generally known as the mercantile system." The latest work of neo-Marxist interpretation published by I. S. Plotkinov treats mercantilism as " the ideology of the monopoly trading companies." Beginning in the age of colonial expansion, it used state power for the protection of trade, controlling trade in the interest of the state. The

with the canons of an imaginary system conceived by economists for purposes of theoretical exposition and mishandled by historians in the service of their political ideals. If I have interpreted aright the doctrinal syntheses to which numberless historians have tried to accommodate themselves, it is clear that many of the rationalised ambitions and fears and jealousies which are their subject matter have been active throughout the world, as perhaps never before, since the economic crisis of 1931. It might be argued to the disadvantage of the present day that what we have gained in logical precision we have lost in sincerity; for it has never been suggested that the restrictionists of the old school claimed for the measures they proposed in their own country's favour that they brought great benefits to other communities.[1]

In the history of nations the brief episode of economic individualism, reflecting, as Continental observers have never tired of reminding us, the special conditions and requirements of this country, may prove to have been a unique experience. The word *neo-mercantilism* is already appearing with ominous frequency in serious discussions. Are we threatened with a further extension of the old aspects and stages? There appears to be much to be said for over-hauling our armoury of classes and categories in order that we may avail ourselves of instruments of greater precision. It would be false to the spirit of a paper which has been almost entirely destructive in intention to suggest even a provisional inventory of more suitable equipment. Moreover, "finding flaws in labels is much easier than finding patently superior substitutes."

I can only suggest that such simple expressions as *national policy* would have more meaning if they could be

plunder of colonies served as the main source of primary accumulation of capital. In the next stage of economic development "the rise of industrial capitalism destroyed mercantilism," according to Mr. Christopher Hill in his summary of Plotkinov's views (*Econ. Hist. Rev.*, May 1938, p. 167).

[1] Cf. L. Robbins, *Econ. Planning and International Order*, p. 16.

applied without inward misgivings to all and every chapter in the history of a nation ; for even a *laissez-faire* State has an economic policy, and may be striving for greatness.[1] And if a community believes in restrictions and public controls, let us analyse their intentions and consequences with the help of appropriate tools of restricted capacity, borrowing either from the vocabulary of the period studied or from the current terminology of the political and economic sciences. As for the peculiar ethos which some people believe to have brooded for ten or fifteen generations over the European peoples—if it can be designated at all with verbal exactitude, it seems to demand at least something more convincing than the barbarous expressions I have inflicted on you so many times this evening.

[1] L. Brentano, *Der Wirtschaftende Mensch in der Geschichte*, s. 29.

ENGLISH AND ČECH INFLUENCES ON THE HUSITE MOVEMENT

By Professor R. R. Betts, B.A., F.R.Hist.S.

Read 10 *March*, 1938

This paper is a preliminary study of the relative indebtedness of the Husite movement in Bohemia to the English reformers of the latter half of the fourteenth century on the one hand, and the native Čech predecessors of Hus on the other ; but it will also raise questions of historical method and of the influence of nationalism on modern historiography, which will perhaps justify the infliction on you of a subject remote from the topics usually discussed by this Society, and one which you will perhaps deem arid and uninvitingly recondite in itself.

I do not pretend that it is the result of the investigation of any large mass of unpublished material, but I would excuse my temerity in flouting that most sacred article of modern historical faith that only in the holy rite of reading manuscripts which no one has ever bothered to look at for four hundred years, lies the scholar's salvation, by this plea : the revival of Čech nationalism in the past hundred years, based as it was by Palacký on the study of the history of the Čech people, given an immense impetus by the emancipation of the Čechs in 1918, has resulted in the editing of an ever-increasing volume of texts and a welling flood of monographs, biographies, and full-grown histories, which most English historians have had little time to digest. It is therefore in a humble attempt to interpret a small fraction of this output, that fraction which perhaps most nearly touches our own history, that I have written this

paper, and I do so with a hearty readiness to acknowledge my constant indebtedness to such patient, scholarly, and able editors and authors as Palacký himself, Emler, Tomek, Flajšhans, Sedlák, Klicman, J. B. Novák and Kamil Krofta, Vlastimil Kybal, Václav Novotný, Otakar Odložilík, F. M. Bartoš, and many others, whose devoted labours have made a study of the reform movement in Bohemia possible.

In the enquiry which I propose to institute are involved questions of fundamental importance to an estimate of that movement. There is the question of the extent of the original contribution which Hus made to that movement: the question whether Hus was a theologian of genius, a philosopher of originality, a reformer of insight and imagination, the original of a movement which was to establish the first national Protestant Church in Europe, the father of the Reformation and regenerator of his country, or whether he was merely the pale reflector of the bright light of the Morning Star of the Reformation, a slavish uncomprehending copyist and pirate, a mere receptacle and vehicle, a mere lifeless duct, devoid of originality and genius, undiscriminating, uncreative, a ventriloquist's doll, reproducing and distorting the utterances of his foreign master. And as a corollary to this question is involved that of the origin of the Husite movement as a whole, the question whether it is to be regarded as the direct issue of a movement which had long been gestating in the fecund womb of Bohemia, begotten of native genius, guarded by its princes, nursed by its scholars and saints, or whether it is merely the monstrous offspring of alien intercourse, an unwished-for misconception of an unnatural union between Wyclifite heresy and Bohemian anti-Germanism, born only to torment Holy Mother Church and Holy Roman Empire. The dispute goes even further than this, for in the hands of historians whose national prejudices are stronger than their respect for the truth the question of the originality or indebtedness of Hus has been made a cardinal point on which turns the

whole conflict between Slav and Teuton, the one party seeing in Hus one of the most illustrious exemplars of the fecundity, genius, and virtue of the Slav race, the other seeing in his servile dependence on Wyclif (a good enough Teuton, *faute de mieux*), but another example of the essentially imitative, uncreative, ineffective race of Slavs.

When what is a purely historical problem has been made the crux of such mighty issues, it is both inviting and bold for a compatriot of Wyclif to enter the lists. But I hope the sequel will prove that I do so not with any national bias, but merely to attempt to find an historian's answer to an historical question.

The usual opinions of Englishmen about Central Europe in general, Bohemia in particular, and Hus most particularly, are largely derived from the work of German scholars. Indeed the sources for a study of this subject have been so little accessible until recently, and the language of the Čechs is regarded as being so laughably and insanely foreign, that it is inevitable that it should have been so. It follows from this that we have tended to adopt the view that Hus and Husitism were almost entirely the products of the introduction of Wyclifite opinions and manuscripts into Bohemia during the thirty years which separate the death of Wyclif from the death of Hus. And, indeed, whatever the motives and deficiencies of the German students of Wyclif and Hus, it must be admitted that such men as Höfler, Buddensieg, Böhringer, Helfert, and above all Johann Loserth, have done a valuable service in demonstrating the undeniably close interdependence of the English and Čech reform movements, a connexion which Čech and Russian scholars are ever ready to admit. Indeed the internationalism that survived into the fourteenth century made such a connexion inevitable.

Let us first endeavour to estimate as concisely and precisely as possible the extent of this connexion and of Wyclif's influence on Hus.

Before that nationalisation of the universities which was

one of the greatest disasters of the general nationalist tendencies of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, there was considerable and very fruitful intercourse between the few European universities which then existed. The extent to which students from all over Europe went to study at Paris is well known; many of the most eminent English scholars worked in French or Italian schools. And thus it was natural that the university which Charles IV founded at Prague in 1348 should draw many of its teachers from abroad, should constitute itself into "nations", and send many of its alumni for long periods to foreign schools of learning. Such eminent Prague doctors as Henry Totting of Oyta, Nicholas Magni of Javor, Henry of Bitterfeld, and Albert Engelschalk, were Germans; Matthew of Cracow, the distinguished author of the *De Squaloribus Ecclesiae*, was a Pole, as also was Jan of Isner; Konrad Waldhauser himself was an Austrian. And it was to be expected that scholars of Prague should go abroad to continue their studies: Konrad von Soltau went from Prague to Heidelberg and later to Cracow; Engelschalk spent some time at Vienna; Matthew at Cracow and Heidelberg. But most important are the prolonged visits of Čech scholars to Paris. Jan z Jenštejna, archbishop of Prague, studied for many years at Paris, and his friend and client Matěj z Janova (Matthias de Janow), the author of the *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, the monumental textbook of the Čech reform movement, spent five years at the University of Paris and earned the distinguished title of "Magister Parisiensis".

Until the incidence of Wyclifite opinions on the university of Paris has been more closely examined than appears to have been done at present, it is difficult to say how much Wyclifite influence may have come to Prague through Paris. What, however, is more directly to the point is to discover what Čech scholars went to Oxford, and as far as I know there are only two of whom we have any evidence that they were there before the death of Wyclif; but one of these two is most important for our

problem, for he was Mistr Vojtěch Raňkův z Ježova (M. Adalbertus Ranconis de Ericinio).[1]

Vojtěch took his master's degree in Paris in 1349, and became rector of that university in 1355, and it is probable that he also studied in Oxford.[2] However that may be, when he came to Prague he brought with him Fitzralph's *Defensorium Curatorum adversus Fratres Mendicantes*.[3] We have further evidence of the connexion between Fitzralph and Vojtěch in two facts : in the copy of Fitzralph's *de Paupertate Salvatoris seu de Mendicitate Fratrum*, now in Vienna, there is an inscription saying that the book belonged to Vojtěch Raňkův [4] ; also it is said that Vojtěch's opponents at Paris had attacked him as being " Armachanus ", that is, a disciple of Fitzralph, bishop of Armagh.[5] But what makes him even more important as a link between England and Bohemia is the well-known provision in his will, made in 1388, whereby he bequeathed scholarships " for those wishing to study at Paris or Oxford in England either in theology or arts, but not in medicine or any other faculty ".[6] The importance of Vojtěch in the history of the Čech reform movement makes these connexions between him and Fitzralph and Oxford a most important link in the argument. This conceited and intolerant controversialist, who refused to wear the tonsure or say his hours, who never took priest's orders, was the first Bohemian polymath. He was an early nationalist, who helped Tomáš ze Štítného to compile his

[1] The other of the two, Johannes Moravetz, the Dominican who read for his master's degree in Oxford some time before 1348, later became papal penitentiary in Bohemia. (*Monumenta Vaticana Res Bohemicas Illustrantia* (1903 ff), I, no. 1014 ; also *ibid.*, Nos. 813, 1015, 1016, 1315.)

[2] See Loserth, J., in *Archiv für Österreichische Geschichte*, LVII, pp. 11, 71, and Loserth, J., *Huss und Wiclif* (1925), p. 62.

[3] Höfler, C., " Anna von Luxemburg," 112 (*Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philosoph.-hist.Klasse XX).

[4] *Codex pal. Vindob.*, 1430. See Loserth, *Huss and Wiclif* (1925), p. 45, n. 1.

[5] Novotný, V., *Náboženské hnutí české ve 14 a 15 stol.*, I, p. 142.

[6] See Loserth in *Mittheilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen*, XVII, p. 210, for the text of the will. See also R. F. Young in the *English Historical Review*, XXXVIII, p. 72.

Čech dictionary, and protected tenant farmers in their rights. He was the friend of the early reformers Waldhauser, Milíč and Matěj z Janova, and he was the protector of Milíč's house of refuge for fallen women, characteristically called by the Biblical name of "Jerusalem". He was a great preacher, to whom was entrusted the honour of pronouncing the funeral oration over Charles IV in 1378. He attacked simony and clerics who affected lay dress. But that he was no mere slavish echo of French and English reformers is shown by a letter he wrote to Martin of Nova advocating frequent communion of the laity.

It is possible that this early interest of the Bohemians in Oxford and England may have been in some measure due to the considerably increased part that England played in European politics in the reign of Edward III, who was in frequent diplomatic relations with Imperial and German princes. Similarly it was natural that English interest in Bohemia should be aroused when the Bohemian kings, already dukes of Luxemburg, became Holy Roman Emperors. At first the Luxemburgers had been the allies of France and the enemies of England, but with the rapid recovery of France under Charles V the necessity of restoring the balance of power drove England to seek the alliance of the greatest of German princes. The common hostility of England and the Luxemburg emperor to France was increased when the outbreak of the Great Schism in 1378 threatened to add ecclesiastical hegemony to the already excessive power of France by the establishment of the papacy permanently at Avignon. Thus political and ecclesiastical considerations drove England and the Emperor to make common cause, and resulted in a series of diplomatic exchanges which culminated in the marriage of Richard II to Anne of Bohemia, daughter of Charles IV, and sister of Hus's sovereign and protector, Václav (Wenzel), Emperor and king of Bohemia.

This connexion between the two countries is made much of by German historians, who see in it another channel by

which Wyclifite opinions could influence Bohemia. As early as 1871 Constantin Höfler, in a lengthy article on Anne of Bohemia, sought with great learning and some success to demonstrate the importance of these negotiations in the religious development of Bohemia, and thereby to counter Palacký's exaltation of Hus as a national hero.[1] The evidence Höfler adduced has recently been supplemented by the documents published by Professor Perroy, so that it is now more or less possible to form some estimate of the probability of an exchange of theological opinions due to this alliance.[2]

As Höfler and those who follow him have laid such considerable emphasis on the importance of these negotiations for the spread of Wyclifite ideas in Bohemia, it is perhaps as well to see what the evidence amounts to. The initiative seems to have been taken in 1379 by Urban VI, who was anxious to unite the Emperor and the king of England in opposition to Clement VII. Urban used as his negotiator the notorious cardinal Pileus de Prata.[3] A correspondence between Václav and Richard was begun in the same year whereby Václav sought to establish a union of Urbanist states against the followers of Clement.[4] Before the end of the year Michael de la Pole and Simon Burley, who had gone to Italy to arrange the marriage of Richard to Catherine Visconti, were deflected from their course, probably at the instigation of Pileus, and visited Germany [5]; there it seems they were met by William Sturry who had been sent from England with new instructions.[6] On their way back from

[1] Höfler, C., "Anna von Luxemburg" (*Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philosoph.-hist.Klasse, vol. XX, pp. 89–240. Wien, 1871).

[2] Perroy, E., *L'Angleterre et le Grand Schisme d'Occident*, Paris, 1933; *Diplomatic Correspondence of Richard II*, Camden Society, Third Series, No. 48.

[3] See Guggenberger, K., *Die Legation des Kardinals Pileus in Deutschland*, 1378–1382, Munich, 1907. Cf. Rymer, *Foedera*, VII, 256–7, 292a, 293b, and Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana* (Rolls Series), I, p. 452.

[4] Rinaldi, *Annales*, VII, s.a. 1379, Nos. XL and XLI, pp. 390–2.

[5] Perroy, *L'Angleterre et le Grand Schisme*, p. 141.

[6] *Ibid.*, 141.

Germany de la Pole and Burley were captured by brigands and the herald Richard Hereford had to be sent to negotiate their release.[1] It may well be that the outcome of their adventurous journey can be seen in the breaking off of the peace negotiations with Charles V in May 1380,[2] and of the marriage negotiations between Anne of Bohemia and the Dauphin. In June the interchange of ambassadors between England and Bohemia began. Simon Burley, Robert Braybrooke (the future bishop of London and enemy of the Lollards), and Bernard van Zetles [3] went to visit Václav and were absent for six months.[4] At the same time "Borzireoge de Siryne," a Bohemian knight, came to England and was given presents by the king, and received at the Savoy by John of Gaunt.[5] At the end of the year 1380 Burley, Braybrooke, and Bernard were sent again on a more solemn embassy to make a formal proposal for Anne's hand, and this time they were accompanied by John Gilbert, bishop of Hereford, Thomas Holland, earl of Kent, Hugh Segrave, seneschal of the Household, Richard Abberbury, knight of the Chamber, and Master Walter Skirlaw.[6] It is worth noting that Skirlaw had been educated at University College, Oxford, and was later to be bishop successively of Coventry, Bath, and Durham.

Anne accepted Richard's offer in January 1381, and she and her mother the Empress-Dowager Elizabeth appointed three Bohemian nobles, Přemysl, duke of Teschen, Conrad Kreyger, seneschal of the Household to Václav, and Peter of Wartenberg his chamberlain, as proctors to go to the king of England to make final arrangements for the mar-

[1] For Hereford's mission and his companions see French Rolls, 20 Jan. 1380 (Richard II, membrane 15).

[2] Perroy, *op. cit.*, pp. 141–3.

[3] Or "Sedlec"; he is described in Rymer, VII, p. 257, as "Miles curiae nostrae"; there is probably no connexion between this mysterious Bernard and the abbey of Sedlec in Bohemia. Cf. French Rolls, year 3, Ric. II., m. 2.

[4] Perroy, *Dipl. Corr. Richard II*, No. 18. Cf. Rymer, VII, pp. 304–5.

[5] Perroy, *L'Angleterre et le Grand Schisme*, p. 145.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 147. Cf. Rymer, IV, pp. 104–5.

riage.[1] Václav appointed the same three nobles as his commissioners for the concluding of the alliance with England for the termination of the Schism.[2] In March the English ambassadors brought the three imperial proctors to England, and Cardinal Pileus came with them with legatine powers.[3] The treaty was signed at Westminster on 2 May, 1381. It cost Richard £3,000 down in the shape of the first instalment of a subsidy to Václav. Two months after their arrival the Bohemians departed, accompanied by Burley, Braybrooke, Zetles, Dagworth, Skirlaw, and three members of Richard's household, John Reynald, William Hert, and Giles de la Chambre, who were commissioned to secure Václav's ratification of the treaty.[4] After Václav had ratified it Sir John Cheyne and Lancaster Herald were sent to his court to escort Anne to England.[5] She arrived in December 1381, and was married to Richard and crowned in January 1382.

In all these comings and goings there seems but little chance that "Borzireoge" or the three noble proctors of the Emperor could have absorbed much in the shape of Wyclifite errors, unless it were through the tainted channel of John of Gaunt, who, however, seems to have been chiefly employed in ministering to their creature comforts. Nor does it seem that the duke of Teschen and his fellows would have been much interested in the niceties of Wyclif's neo-realism or predestinarianism, for from what we know of them they appear to have been all essentially diplomats and courtiers, and I have not been able to find that they were in any way associated with religious movements in Bohemia. It is perhaps slightly more possible that the dozen English commissioners who visited Václav may have sown the seeds

[1] Letters of procuration in the Public Record Office, E.30, 292 and 293. Cf. Rymer, IV, pp. 105–6.

[2] P. R. O., *Dipl. Docs.*, E.294. Cf. Rymer, IV, p. 106.

[3] Perroy, *op. cit.*, p. 149. For Pileus' unpopular conduct in England, cf. Adam of Usk, p. 2; Walsingham, I, p. 452; Rymer, IV, p. 109; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, I, p. 615.

[4] Perroy, *op. cit.*, p. 153. Rymer, IV, pp. 117–121.

[5] Perroy, p. 154.

of heresy there (though in some cases it is doubtful whether they had actually to go to Prague to find him—he did occasionally visit his German dominions). But it seems little probable that courtiers and civil servants such as Burley, de la Pole, Thomas Holland, Segrave, Abberbury, Dagworth, Reynald, Hert and their fellows had much interest in theological propaganda. It might seem more likely that the ecclesiastics Skirlaw and Braybrooke would have done so, but the responsibility for inspiring the Bohemians to religious revolt of a man like Braybrooke cannot have been very great, for he himself was an arch-enemy of Wyclif. He gave much offence to the Londoners in 1382 by refusing to annul the statute against preachers of heresy; he it was who secured the co-operation of the king against the Lollards who nailed their pamphlets on the door of Saint Paul's; it was he too who secured the recantation of Thomas Latimer and Richard Story.[1] As for Skirlaw, he was a typical civil servant, a chancery clerk and Keeper of the Privy Seal, whose numerous preferments seem to have been the reward, not of theological, but of bureaucratic abilities.

The political connexion between England and Bohemia did not end with the marriage of Richard and Anne, but appears to have continued spasmodically until Anne's death in 1394. There was a further exchange of diplomats between 1382 and 1384 to secure the renewal of the treaty. More important for the question we are examining is the retinue which Anne brought with her, chiefly chaplains and ladies. But we know little except their names: Henry of Reybutz, priest and "commensalis" of the queen; one "Jacobus," her confessor; Johannes Lantgraf and Henricus Potus, knights, and that elusive Agnes whom Robert de Vere married.[2] That they were interested in Wyclif and Lollardy is never suggested by our documents. Complaints against

[1] Round, J. H., on Braybrooke in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, II, pp. 1151 ff.

[2] Perroy, *Dipl. Corr. Richard II*, Nos. 34, 57. Issue Roll 490, m. 14.

their rapacity were made in Parliament, and many of them were sent home in 1382.[1] Indeed their chief function seems to have been that of horse dealers to Richard, who sent certain of them, Rockaus, Walter and John Swartes, and Sithellius back to Bohemia to replenish his stables.[2]

It has been necessary to say so much about so little because Höfler's article on "Anna of Luxemburg" became the basis of the German and English approach to the subject of the relations between Wyclif and Husitism. But an examination of the material seems to indicate that the coincidence of these political negotiations has been made the ground for an exaggeration of their importance for the religious developments in Bohemia.

Höfler was an Austrian, and was perhaps thereby to some extent prejudiced against the Bohemians and inclined to ask, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" And that has been the more or less unconscious attitude of those German historians who followed him, and most notably of Johann Loserth.

Loserth is universally recognised as one of the most learned students of the Wyclifite movement, and he brought to the study of the relations of Hus and Wyclif a knowledge of Wyclif's theological writings almost unequalled, and his contribution to the study of the problem is the more important because it is based on so much incontrovertible fact. It has been his task to illustrate the coming of Wyclif's writings to Bohemia and the frequency of Hus's quotations from those works.

It is clear that certain of Wyclif's philosophical works reached Bohemia in the last decade of the fourteenth century, for Hus himself copied and glossed the *De Materia et Forma*, the *De Ideis*, and the *De Universalibus* in 1398.[3]

[1] *Rot. parl.*, III, p. 248. Rymer, IV, p. 139.

[2] Perroy, *op. cit.*, No. 37. Treasury rolls, 72, m. 21. For the unpopularity of Anne's retinue, see Walsingham, II, p. 46; *Continuatio Eulogii*, III, p. 355; Knighton, II, pp. 150–1; *Mon. Westm.*, 12.

[3] Novotný, V., *M. Jan Hus*, II, pp. 59 ff. Bartoš, F. M., *Husitství a cizina*, p. 29.

But it was not until the turn of the century that Wyclif's theological writings began to filter through to Bohemia, and even then it was some years before they were known there in detail or completeness. It seems that Jerome of Prague, who spent two years in Oxford (probably the years 1399 to 1401) brought back with him to Prague the *Trialogus*, the *De Eucharistia*, the *Dialogus* and the *De Simonia*.[1] Certainly Tomáš ze Štítného knew something about Wyclif's eucharistic views very early in the century.[2] But the main material for the study of Wyclif in Bohemia did not arrive until after the visit of Mikuláš Faulfiš and Jiří z Kněhnic to England in the years 1406 and 1407.[3] They evidently not only visited Oxford and conversed with some of Wyclif's followers there, but also it seems possible that they visited Oldcastle ; the copy of the *De Domino Divino* they made has a note : " Braybrug psano," and Braybrook was the manor of the Lollard Thomas Latimer and its incumbent the Lollard Robert Hoke.[4] Faulfiš and Kněhnic not only brought back a fragment of Wyclif's tomb, but also copies they had made of the *De Veritate Sacre Scripture*, *De Dominio Divino* and, most important of all, the *De Ecclesia*. Either at the same time or within a few years copies of the other books of the *Summa Theologica* : the *De Civili Dominio*, *De Officio Regis*, *De Potestate Pape*, *De Apostasia*, *De Blasphemia*, *De Mandatis Divinis*, and the *De Statu Innocentie*, were also available to Hus and his fellows.[5]

From this time until the disappearance of open Lollardy in England relations between the two movements continued spasmodically. In 1410 Richard Wyche, a pupil of Wyclif who was later burnt at the stake, wrote to Hus a letter of sympathy and encouragement to the Bohemian reformers,

[1] Novotný, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 104 ff. Bartoš, *op. cit.*, p. 32.
[2] Loserth, *Huss und Wiclif*, p. 64.
[3] Bartoš, *op. cit.*, pp. 40–1, 47n., 62, 110. Loserth, *op. cit.*, pp. 65, 194–203.
[4] Loserth, *op. cit.*, pp. 196–9. Cf. *De Dominio Divino*, ed. R. L. Poole, p. 249.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 200–1.

to which Hus replied.[1] In the same year Oldcastle wrote in a similar vein to Voks of Waldštejn and Zdislav of Zvířetic.[2] Some three years later Oldcastle wrote to King Václav himself, commending to him the cause of the reformation in general and Hus in particular.[3] Of course, the Lollard who had the greatest influence in Bohemia next to Wyclif himself was Peter Payne, but as his activities in building up the Taborite party fall after the death of Hus, they lie outside the scope of this paper.

From all this it is quite clear that at least after 1407 there was abundant manuscript material in Prague for the influence of Wyclif to have its full force. No one would deny the cogency of this part of Loserth's argument; nor is it possible to controvert the next point which he makes, namely, that Hus used the writings of Wyclif extensively, quoting from them sometimes whole paragraphs word for word, frequently introducing sentences, phrases and locutions that undoubtedly come from Wyclif, usually without acknowledgment. Indeed it would be strange if he had not done so. It must be remembered that the Church in England and the Church in Bohemia were parts of the same œcumenical institution, which was undergoing the same modifications and pursuing the same policy by the same means in all parts of Roman Christendom. It therefore follows that there were the same causes and symptoms of corruption and secularisation in the two countries. Thus Wyclif's spirited and cogent criticisms of the pride and ambitions of the papacy, of the officiousness and rapacity of the Curia, of the worldliness and carelessness of the bishops, the devotion of the secular clergy to worldly things, their sloth, ignorance and intemperance, were eagerly read by Hus and his companions, and freely used by them in their writings. Wyclif's attack on the inordinate preoccupations of the regulars, the idleness, luxury and

[1] Text in Novotný, *Husova Corres.*, c. 22, pp. 75–9.
[2] Text in Loserth, *op. cit.*, pp. 210–12.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 212–13.

spiritual pride of the monks, the ambitious and greedy business of the friars, his animadversions against the abuse of relics, images, indulgences, papal reservations, ecclesiastical tenths and jubilees, were as easily applicable to the Bohemian as to the English Church, and were therefore freely and gladly used by the Bohemian reformers. The Great Schism was as baneful in its consequences and as distressing in the doubts and misgivings it inspired to Bohemia as to England.

But there are also peculiar reasons why the subjects of Václav should have found in the works of English reformers much that was apt to their own state. The Roman Church had never sat easily in either country, each of which was on the periphery of the Roman obedience, neither of which had ever been Romanised as had been Gaul, Italy, Spain and parts of Germany; to both of them the Latin of the liturgy was completely alien in a sense which was not true of the Romance-speaking countries. The underlying longing for their forbidden Slavonic liturgy on the part of the Čechs corresponded to the traditional anti-papalism which in England dated at least from the first half of the thirteenth century. Both countries had achieved a position of national unity and self-consciousness at a time when France, Germany, Italy and Spain were still at best loose federations of feudatories, and both resented therefore with the full force of adolescent national feeling their ecclesiastical, judicial and financial dependence on an alien and often hostile papacy. As Englishmen resented the supra-national control expressed in the papal claims to feudal suprèmacy and the Johannine tribute, in papal reservations and provisions and the burdensome and galling exercise of appellate jurisdiction by the Curia, so too were the Bohemians exasperated by the deposition of Václav by Boniface IX in 1403, and the refusal of Alexander V to raise the ban in 1409, and to them too the whole issue of national independence was brought home by the onerous demands expressed in papal tenths, jubilees and indulgences. The

pride and pockets of Englishmen were affected by the frequent collation of absentee foreigners to benefices; in Bohemia many of the highest and wealthiest incumbencies were occupied by Germans.

While these considerations made a sympathy between Čech and English reformers natural, there were others which more particularly attracted Hus to Wyclif. Hus's first acquaintance with Wyclif was through his philosophical works, and the majesty, completeness and uncompromising courage of Wyclif's philosophical system profoundly influenced a mind already well disposed to accept its main tenets and applaud its methods. The neo-realism of Wyclif, his unhesitating and devastating attack on the "epigonic nominalism" [1] of Ockham, Scotus and d'Ailly, his stout refusal to believe that faith and reason were irreconcilable, his original and effective use of the historical method to show the novelty and frailty of many of the claims of the contemporary Church, found in the mind of Hus, already disposed towards such ways of thought by his environment and reading, an approving response. Hus, who as preacher at "Bethlehem" had come to value highly the place of the pulpit in the Christian ministry, applauded the founder of the poor preachers of England; Wyclif's attack on the wealth of the Church found amongst the disciples of Milíč a ready echo; finally Wyclif's remedy for all the ills of the Church, a return to the primitive simplicity of organisation and doctrine of the apostolic Church, found an eager response in Hus, the heir of Milíč and Matěj z Janova who had been expounding the efficacy of the same panacea for thirty years.

Thus, when Loserth sets out parallel passages from the writings of Hus and Wyclif side by side and demonstrates thereby the frequency with which they correspond, not only in ideas but in their actual wording, it should be no cause for surprise to realise how much Hus owed to Wyclif. We

[1] I owe the phrase and much besides to Bartoš, *Husitství a cizina*, p. 27.

must remember, too, what Bartoš has pointed out,[1] that there is nothing unusual in the way Hus quotes Wyclif at such length and without acknowledgment. Every medieval work of scholarship uses its authorities in just the same way. An author was not respected for his originality, but for his knowledge of the dicta of those who had treated the same subject before him, and the bulk of the theological writings of the late Middle Ages consists largely in the collection and rearrangement of lengthy extracts from the writings of others. It must be remembered too that these authorities were so universally known that the necessity of referring continually to one's sources by name was never realised; certainly Hus never dreamed that he would be deceiving his readers into thinking that what he pirated from Wyclif was his own. Nowadays we read so much and so fast and books are so numerous that we do not remember one hundredth part of what we read, and when we quote we do so deliberately and consciously, giving references because we know that the odds are that the reader will not have read the book from which we quote, or that if he has he will not recognise the passage. But before the invention of the printing press the scope and manner of men's reading were different. There were fewer books to be read, and there was time to get to know those one did read thoroughly. As often as not reading meant learning by heart. It seems to me apparent that many of the Wyclifite passages in Hus's writings are to be explained not as copying from a treatise of Wyclif but as the more or less conscious reproduction of passages which have been memorised. The fact that Hus more often gets near to Wyclif's words than quotes him verbatim,[2] and that he sometimes corrects Wyclif's own misquotations seems to bear this out.[3]

[1] Bartoš, *op. cit.*, pp. 20–3.

[2] Cf. Wyclif, *de Mandatis Divinis*, p. 153, with Hus, *Expositio Decalogi*, Opera, ed. Flajšhans, Vol. I, p. 7; Wyclif, *op. cit.*, p. 159, with Hus, *op. cit., ibid.*; Wyclif, *de Civili Domino*, p. 368, with Hus, *de Ecclesia*, CCIa; Wyclif, *de Simonia*, p. 2, with Hus, Opera CXCIIII.

[3] Cf. Wyclif, *Political Works*, II, p. 666, with Hus, Opera I, p. 175b.

Hus omits whole paragraphs in the midst of passages he is quoting from Wyclif, adds remarks of his own, rearranges the material, sometimes gives references for the passages he is quoting which Wyclif himself omitted to give ; sometimes he gives a sense to the quotations which was not in the original. If we can believe that Hus knew a great part of Wyclif's works by heart and quoted them from memory we can explain simply a crux which Loserth has to deal with by a very doubtful assumption. When Hus was in prison in Constance awaiting his trial he is said to have composed there his *De Sufficientia Legis Christi*. Loserth says that this work is so full of Wyclifite views and teaching, contains so many themes from Wyclif's tractates which correspond so literally with Wyclif's own words, that the *De Sufficientia* could not have been composed by Hus in his prison at Constance, where he had no books available, but must have been written much earlier, probably before he left Bohemia.[1] Is it necessary thus to fly in the face of the evidence ? We know that when Milíč was imprisoned in the Ara Cœli in Rome in 1367 he compiled there his *Sermon on the Last Day*, a work composed entirely without the help of books, which is a network of quotations from the Bible and the Fathers.[2] There is every reason to believe that Hus's acquaintance with Wyclif was sufficient for him to be capable of a similar feat of memory.

Loserth then has apparently misunderstood the whole method of medieval scholarship and misinterpreted the nature of the dependence of Hus on Wyclif. He flatly denies any originality in Hus, and ascribes the whole Husite movement to Wyclif's inspiration. Invaluable as is Loserth's contribution to our knowledge of the relations of the two men, there are, however, several considerations which force us to doubt the conclusions he has drawn from the verbal comparison of their works.

In the first place Loserth was a German inhabitant of

[1] Loserth, *Huss und Wiclif*, p. 124.
[2] Novotný, *Náboženské hnutí české ve* 14 *a* 15 *stol.*, I, p. 71.

Bohemia, and that fact has determined his whole approach to the question. A member of a national minority which before 1918 dominated the Čech majority and since that year was subject to it, it was perhaps inevitable that he should have adopted the attitude which is the psychological consequence of such a relationship. The martyred Hus is the national hero of the Čech people ; the champion of national liberties who expelled the Germans from the university of Prague in 1409 ; the man who defied Sigismund and whose spirit inspired Žižka and Prokop to lead the people to repel the attacks of the German crusaders in the Husite wars. Philosopher, theologian, saint, patriot and martyr, his name and work were flaunted throughout Czechoslovakia as the victor in the battle of Čech against German. If then it could be shown that as philosopher and theologian and nationalist he is but the pale reflection of an Englishman, without scholarship, art, or ideas of his own, if it could be shown that the man who was burnt at Constance was but Wyclif in effigy, the idol of the triumphant and exulting Slavs would be overthrown, and the Teutonic thesis that all that there has been of greatness in Bohemia is an importation from a Teutonic source would have been vindicated. I believe that Loserth has been subconsciously perverted by considerations such as these, and that here lies the root of the inadequacy and partiality of his treatment of the problem.

The first specific charge to be made against Loserth is that he confined his collation of the works of Wyclif and Hus entirely to Hus's Latin works, and never once cites examples of Hus's indebtedness from his works in the vernacular. Indeed Loserth gives but little indication that he was acquainted with Hus's Čech writings at all. Now this is very important, because Hus had begun to preach and write in Čech [1] before the manuscripts brought back by Faulfiš and Kněhnic had made him conversant with the main body of Wyclif's theological works, and because it

[1] See Novotný, *M. Jan Hus*, I, i, pp. 182 ff.

was natural that in his Latin writings, where his approach is more erudite and therefore more academic, his debt to the English schoolman should be greater than in his vernacular works, where the treatment is more popular. Thus it is not surprising that the evidence of Wyclif's influence is much less marked in his Čech works, because he is here dealing with matters that have a more particular reference to his own country and people, and his method is not so much that of the schoolman as that of the teacher and publicist. It is interesting to observe that Loserth, while quoting certain parallelisms with Wyclif's *De Simonia* to be found in such Latin works of Hus as the *De Sex Erroribus* [1] makes no attempt to collate the *De Simonia* with Hus's treatment of the same subject in Čech, the *O Svatokupectví*. This work, it is generally agreed, is amongst the best that Hus ever did. It is true that here too we find reminiscences of the *De Simonia* of Wyclif, but as Novotný says, some seven-eighths of the work is original. Much of it is topical, having reference to the triple schism and to the domestic circumstances of his day.[2] Loserth's ignoring of the vernacular writings of Hus is as dangerous to a just estimate of his work as would be an account of Wyclif which ignored his English works. Not only were the Čech works of Hus profoundly influential in shaping the course of the popular movement which appeared after his death, but it is natural that they should express ideas which he had absorbed in his native air and inherited from his native predecessors.

The strong anti-Bohemian prejudices of Loserth are also to be seen in his arbitrary treatment of the views expressed on Hus's work by modern historians of Slavonic birth. We must realise that the German campaign to belittle Hus has its counterpart in a rival campaign waged by the foes of Germanism to emphasise his greatness. It was unfortunate that the first edition of Loserth's *Huss und Wiclif* was

[1] Loserth, *Huss und Wiclif*, p. 182.

[2] See Novotný, *M. Jan Hus*, I, ii, pp. 238–42. The text of the *O Svatokupectví* is in Erben, I, pp. 474 ff.

published in 1884, just at the time when Panslavism was rising to its height and Katkov was initiating his great campaign in the Moscow press against Bismarck and Austria and all things German. The Russian Slavophils were eager to seize on any example of Slavonic achievement, and Hus therefore became an object of admiration and self-congratulation throughout the Slavonic world. Russian scholars saw in Husitism something unique, which could have only flourished on Slavonic soil. The exaltation of Hus by Palacký as a Čech national hero was taken up by such Russian scholars as Yelagin, Novikov, Gilferding, Lamanski and Palmov. Loserth's attempt therefore to belittle Hus's achievements aroused an outcry in Russia, and in the *Kievski Universitetski Izvestia* of 1884 there appeared an article by Florinski [1] which ably pointed out some of the weaknesses of Loserth's thesis. He pointed out that Loserth had totally ignored the religious opposition in fourteenth-century Bohemia to the Latinism of the Roman Church, expressed in a movement to re-establish the use of Slavonic ritual, corporal communion of the laity, and the establishment of a Slavonic monastery by Charles IV as early as 1347. Florinski also drew attention to Loserth's failure to deal adequately with the position of Hus in relation to frequent communion of the laity and communion in both kinds by laymen. Since the denial of the chalice to the laity in 1350 there had been a growing demand in Bohemia for its restoration. Loserth ignored the fact that Matěj z Janova had made this the basis of his teaching, and that Hus had identified himself with this purely native movement, not only, as Loserth implies, in his last tractate written in prison at Constance, but also in his *De Corpore Christi* (1401) and in the *De Sanguine Christi sub Specie Vini a Laicis Sumendo.*[2] Finally, Florinski notices that the

[1] Университетскія Извѣстія. Кіевѣ, May 1884.

[2] Florinski refers to Palmov, "The question of the chalice in the Husite movement," Petersburg, 1881, and Lamanski, "Important participants in Western Slavonic education in the XVth, XVIth and XVIIth centuries," *Slav. Sbornik*, I, 1875, pp. 546 ff.

greater part of the evidence of Hus's Wyclifitism Loserth takes from the opponents of the Husites ; and that he does not take into account the sermons, instructions and letters of Hus written in Čech, which were both popular and influential ; and that he ignores the great and important differences between the teaching of Hus and that of Wyclif.

Thus was the stage for this international conflict between Slav and German set, and the reputation of Hus was the trophy which was to be torn down or defended at all costs. Until German historians of Bohemia can bring themselves to read texts and monographs written in Čech and Russian they must remain at a disadvantage in the controversy ; the whole subsequent history of this problem consists in the elaboration of the points Florinski made ; the second edition of Loserth's *Huss und Wiclif*, in 1925, made no serious attempt to meet these criticisms and has merely served to delay the proper understanding of the facts in Germany and England, where his authority is still decisive.

Let us examine Loserth's thesis in the light of the researches of recent Čech scholars.

First, attention must be drawn to the doubtful validity and the limitations of Loserth's method of the collation of texts in parallel columns. Such textual comparisons are valid only as long as they are used to demonstrate a textual dependence ; all they can be made to prove is that sometimes Hus quoted Wyclif with a greater or less degree of accuracy. But to attempt to demonstrate thereby, as Loserth does, a complete dependence of ideas is to make an assumption which the evidence by no means warrants. It is one of the vices of a certain type of modern historical scholarship to become so much engrossed with the mechanical process of the detection of detailed verbal similarities as to neglect the duty of endeavouring to estimate the achievement of a man or a movement as a whole. Loserth's method also well illustrates another vice of modern historiography, namely the readiness to be tempted to ascribe to interconnexions and direct influence movements in

different countries which were the independent product of similar conditions and developments. The truth appears to be that the reform movement in Bohemia had already developed very considerably before a single one of Wyclif's manuscripts was known there and that those common features of the religious life of Christendom which we have already noticed had produced a reaction and a demand for reform in Bohemia similar in many respects to what was happening in contemporary England and quite independent of it. Thus when Wyclif's works were introduced into Bohemia the ground was already well prepared, men's minds had been educated by a distinguished line of autochthonous reformers to greet Wyclif, not so much as a leader and master, but rather as a fellow-worker in a neighbouring vineyard, overgrown with much the same weeds as those with which the Bohemians were only too well acquainted. Of course the similarity between conditions in Bohemia and those in England was not complete. There were differences in national temperament, in the political and social background, in the mental inheritance and environment of the two nations, which established important differences between the ideals and methods of the two reform movements. A brief examination of this native background and an enumeration of the vital differences between the beliefs and methods of the Husite movement and English Wyclifitism must therefore be undertaken.

The rapid publication of the writings of the pre-Husite Bohemian reformers is daily making clearer how much Hus and Husitism owed to Bohemians who worked and wrote and died years before a single manuscript of Wyclif reached Bohemia. The task of verbally collating the voluminous works of Hus with the even more voluminous works of his native predecessors has hardly yet begun, but even so a reading of such works as have become available makes it increasingly clear that not only were many of Hus's characteristic and most influential ideas developed from those who had prepared the way for him in Bohemia, but also

that he had read and studied the works of such men, and in particular the greatest of them, Matěj z Janova.[1] Hus's acquaintance with the theological works of Wyclif came first when he was some thirty-five years old, after he had spent some twenty years at Prague, which had already for half a century been the centre of a native reform movement. The university itself was a symbol of that nationalism which was to take so powerful a hold on Hus and to which he was to contribute so much. The spirit of Charles IV, its founder, the father of his country, and the first to attempt to restore religion in Bohemia, still pervaded the city he had so much enriched and beautified. It was Charles who had, in 1363, invited to Prague Konrad Waldhauser, whose work was to open the floodgates to that stream of reform which was to flow with ever-increasing majesty and power until Hus came to sail on its flood into the open sea of a Bohemia nationally and ecclesiastically free.

In the work of these early Bohemian reformers we can see the germ of all those ideas which are most characteristic of Hus, and of the movement to which he gave his name, far more clearly than in the work of Wyclif. Waldhauser, though himself no Bohemian by birth, was a pioneer. He attacked the formalism of contemporary religion and preached the necessity of the religion of the heart; he decried the value of monastic promises of salvation in return for testamentary bequests; Waldhauser revived popular preaching in Prague, and at his denunciations the rich cast off their gay clothes, usurers relented and gallants were converted. His fiery zeal was directed against the avarice of the friars, the sale of favoured burial-places and the folly of making pilgrimages to the two rival heads of Saint Barnabas.[2]

[1] Cf. Bartoš, F. M., *Husitství a cizina*, p. 24. Sedlák, *Studie a texty*, p. 363.

[2] Compare with this exposure of the false claims of relics by Waldhauser Hus's mission to Wilsnack to examine the genuineness of the miracles reported to have been performed by the Sacred Blood exposed there. (*Mag. Joannis Hus de Sanguine Christi*, edited by Flajšhans in Mag. Jo. Hus, *Opera omnia*, Tom. I, fasc. 3, p. 33).

His writings were as effective as his preaching—he composed the *Postilla studentium Pragensium*, a sermon hand book for the training of preachers, and his cycle of sermons on the Passion laid emphasis on the necessity of subjective qualification for the priesthood.[1]

The work so well begun by Konrad was taken up by his disciple, the former chancery clerk, Jan Milíč of Kroměříže, a product of the humanism of the court, cultured, and of an elegant latinity. He was converted in 1362 to a life of self-abnegation and devotion to the cause of reform. He gave to the movement an ascetic and apocalyptic character, and both preached and practised that clerical poverty which was to become one of the main items in Hus's remedial programme. Milíč too carried on the tradition of preaching and prepared the pulpit from which Hus was to preach so powerfully. As Hus was later to brave his enemies at Constance, so too Milíč went into the lion's den, first at Rome and later at Avignon, where he died. He preached the coming of Antichrist, he instructed young preachers in his *Abortivus* and in his sermons on the Grace of God ; he translated part of Gregory's *Moralia* and wrote prayers both in Čech and German. He too gave to the movement a social character which it never lost, by the establishment of a very successful refuge for prostitutes. With Milíč begins the first timid criticism of an over-weening papacy ; with him begins the movement which pointed to the Bible as the first and ultimate authority for faith and morals ; he continually directs men to the example of Jesus ; and finally by instituting the practice of daily communion for his refugees in " Jerusalem " he started a movement which was ultimately to become the distinguishing feature

[1] For Waldhauser see Loskot, F., *Konrad Waldhauser*, Prague, 1909 ; Novotný, V., *Náboženské hnutí české*, pp. 157 ff. ; Menčík, F., " Konrad Waldhauser," in *Abh. der kgl. böhm. Ges. d. Wissenschaft*, VI, Folge XI ; Palacký, F., " Die Vorläufer des Hussitentums " in *Böhmen, N.A.*, 1869, p. 16 ; *Apologia Konradi in Waldhausen*, ed. Höfler, C., in *Fontes Rerum Austriacarum*, 2, VI, pp. 17–39. For complete bibliography see Zirbt, *Bibliografie České Historie*, II, 1117.

of later Husitism. Milíč's writings were widely and freely copied and quoted, and it is inconceivable that he could have been without influence on Hus and Hus's friends.[1]

Milíč had done much to give its idiosyncratic form to the Čech reform movement, but it was to acquire one characteristic in particular which is not to be found in his writings, namely, its nationalism. It is here that the part played in forming the body of Husite beliefs by Tomáš of Štítný is more important. Tomáš was born in the Tábor district, was married and widowed, and remained throughout his life a country gentleman. As a layman, and one who apparently never graduated at the University, he occupies a unique place in the movement. It is first and foremost as an interpreter of reformist ideas in the Čech tongue that he takes his place as a link between the generation of Milíč and that of Hus. He translated some of Augustine's works into Čech, and compounded for himself a mysticism based on a study of Hugo and Richard of Saint Victor, Bernard, Bonaventura, Robert Holkot of Oxford, and Henry Suso. These translations were not literal, but rather adaptations. Tomáš must have contributed to the general building up of the movement by conversation (often more effective than writing), for he was the friend of Matthew of Cracow, of Jan of Jenštejn and Vojtěch Raňkův. But his most evident influence is the educational treatises in the vernacular which he began to write for his orphaned children and then gradually adapted to a wider public : the *Knihy naučení křesťanského* (Books of Christian education) and the lay sermons of the *Řeči nedělní a svateční* (Sermons for Sundays and Saints' Days). Tomáš was the eloquent enemy

[1] For Milíč see : Zirbt, *Bibliografie České Historie*, II, 1117–18 ; *Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, I, pp. 401–30 ; Matéj z Janova, *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, ed. Kybal, III, pp. 358–67 (Narracio de Milicio) ; Palacký, *Vorläufer*, pp. 39–46, and *Gesch. Böhmens*, III, p. 1 ; Klicman, " Studie o Milíčovi," in *Listy phil.*, XVII ; Novotný, *Náboženské hnutí české*, I, pp. 65 ff. Milíč's sermons are edited by Menčik in *Věstník* (1890).

of superstition, magic, relics, vain repetitions, fastings, masses for the dead, pilgrimages and indulgences. Before his death he had heard of Wyclif's eucharistic heresy of Remanence, and it is significant for our purpose that he rejected it and insisted on the merits and benefits of frequent communion. Also he foreshadowed Hus's rejection of Wyclif's doctrine of the inefficacy of the sacraments performed by evil priests.[1]

The growing reform movement which had its saint in Milíč and its philosopher in Tomáš of Štítný, had its theologian in Matěj z Janova (Matthias of Janow),[2] whose monumental work the *Regulae veteris et novi testamenti* deserves to be placed very high amongst the achievements of the pre-Lutheran reformers. It is certain now that Hus was acquainted with his works,[3] and no one can have read the *Regulae* without being convinced that Hus's characteristic ideas were greatly influenced by Matěj. It is a work of profound scholarship, consolidated on a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures, the Fathers, and the Schoolmen. It is replete with the spirit of Milíč; it has his Biblical language, his mystical anticipation of the imminent advent of Antichrist; it anticipates Hus in its desire to return to the primitive simplicity of the apostolic Church, its constant appeal to the crucified Jesus, to the Bible as the sole source of faith, to the "liberty of the Holy Spirit". His learned and weighty exposition of the evils of hypocrisy, "adinventiones hominum," papal provisions, reservations of absolution, the superfluity, idleness, avarice, pride and jealousy of the regulars, are all part of the armoury which Hus was to assume. But perhaps his most important legacy to the

[1] For Tomáš ze Štítného see: Durdika, J., *Toma ze Štítného*, Prague, 1879; Wenzig, *Studien über den Ritter Thomas von Štítný*; Novotný, *Náboženské hnutí české*, I, pp. 179–214.

[2] Kybal, V, *M. Matěj z Janova, jeho zivot a spisy*, Prague, 1905; *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, edited Kybal, V. and Odložilík, O. Innsbruck and Prague, 1903–26; Novotný, *Náboženské hnutí české*, I, pp. 145–75.

[3] Bartoš, F. M., *Husitství a cizina*, 24; Sedlák, *Studie a texty*, I (1914), p. 363.

Husite movement was, first, his doctrine of the Church as the " invisible communion of the elect ", and secondly, his insistence on the daily, corporal participation of the laity in the sacrament of the altar as the supreme vehicle of the reformation.

In parenthesis it may here be noted how easy it is to ascribe to Wyclif what is the work of the Bohemian reformers from the fact that a marginal note on the first page of Codex C of Matěj's *Regulae* there is a note : " Tractatus Johannis Wikleff. Ideo caute legas, ne incidas in laqueum mortis."

Of course we do not know that Hus ever met Matěj, who died in 1394. The final link in the chain is supplied preeminently by a lesser man, who had, however, much in common with both of them, Štěpán z Kolína. He was provost, dean of arts and rector of the University of Prague while Hus was a youthful graduate there. Hus may well have heard the sermons which Štěpán preached as cursor in Theology, have heard him insist on the need for an educated priesthood, heard him inveigh against pluralities, indulgences, clerical immorality, and the wealth and luxury of prelates. In 1396 Štěpán was appointed preacher at the reformers' headquarters, the chapel of " Bethlehem " in Prague, where Hus was to succeed him. Here too Hus may very well have heard him argue that a man may, in case of necessity, confess to another than a priest and that prayers to the saints are unavailing. At all points Štěpán's views look both backwards to Matěj and forwards to Hus : his conviction that a pure and simple priesthood is the first essential of reform ; his violent attack on the simony that was rotting the Bohemian Church ; his alarm at the evils inherent in indulgences and papal jubilees ; most of all by his acceptance of the freedom of the will, his emphasis on the necessity of renunciation and clerical poverty, and his combination of strict orthodoxy in the matter of transubstantiation with a passionate devotion to the saving and reforming virtues of the Eucharist, he completes the chain

which binds Hus undeniably to the work of his native predecessors.[1]

Waldhauser, Milíč, Štítný, Matěj, Štěpán—these are but the best known of a whole army of Bohemians who made some contribution to the mass of ideas, sentiments, theories, proposals, habits of thought, to the whole ethos of the Bohemian reform movement, into the thick of which Hus was plunged as soon as he came to Prague ; it was the very air he breathed, the constant conversation of refectory, dormitory, and corridor, the substance of lecture and sermon, of the literature, ephemeral and enduring, which was his constant reading. The mind and the views of Hus were already shaped and moulded before ever Wyclif's theological works came to Bohemia. When Hus first met those works he welcomed them gladly as confirming, developing, and enriching much that he had already long been thinking. The depth and breadth of Wyclif's philosophy, the vigour and courage of his criticism, his acute historical method, his remorseless logic, the perspicacity of his understanding, did not create in Hus a passion for reform ; they merely were complementary to what he already knew and thought ; they supplied fuel to an already fiercely burning fire ; they gave an added impetus to an already swiftly moving current. But always it was his native inheritance which supplied the substance of Husitism ; Wyclif was never adopted as an ultimate and infallible authority ; as his ideas and words were found to concur with those already accepted at Prague, they were eagerly adopted and incorporated. But always Hus and his companions maintained their independence, and it is only by an evaluation of the points on which they differed from Wycliff that the independence and autonomy of Husitism can be appreciated. Those points of difference are neither few nor unimportant.

Wyclif looked always to the state and the secular arm to purify the Church ; Hus (and when the " state " was

[1] For Štěpán z Kolína see : Odložilík, O., *Štěpán z Kolína*, Prague, 1924 ; Bartoš, F. M., in *Časopis národného musea*, 1924, pp. 65 ff.

embodied in so broken a reed as the hapless Václav, the fact is not surprising), saw the remedy for a corrupt sacerdotalism in a " national church organised on the democratic principle of free election of parish priests and bishops, to realise in the church the basic sovereignty of the people ". [1]

Wyclif fully identified himself with the predestinarian position implicit in Augustine ; but Hus, subconsciously realising how barren that forbidding faith must be, realising that Wyclif's predestinarianism had largely contributed to the unpopularity of his teaching, clung to his faith in the freedom of the will,[2] and in so doing continued in the footsteps of Matěj [3] and Štěpán z Kolína.[4]

Wyclif taught that an evil priest was devoid of spiritual power and unable to effect the sacraments ; Matěj, so strong had been his faith in the sacramental efficacy of the Eucharist, had maintained that mortal sin in a priest did not invalidate his sacramental acts,[5] and here too Hus follows Matěj and not Wyclif.[6] It is fundamentally the ardent sacramentalism which underlies the whole Husite movement which prevents Hus from conceding that the efficacy of the sacrament of orders can be destroyed by the sins of an ordained priest, or that his evil deeds render inoperative the words of consecration of the Mass. And it is precisely in all that concerns the Eucharist that the strength of the native influences on Hus can most clearly be seen.

Wyclif saw in the doctrine of transubstantiation a recent innovation for which there was no scriptural or patristic

[1] Bartoš, F. M., *Husitství a cizina*, 53. Cf. Hus, *O Svatokupectví*, ed. Novotný, pp. 131–4.

[2] For Hus on predestination and free-will see : Hus, *Super Sent.*, I, dist. 38 (p. 162) ; dist. 40 (pp. 165–6) ; dist. 17 (p. 110) ; dist. 41 (pp. 168–9). Cf. Novotný and Kybal, *M. Jan Hus, život a učení*, II, i, pp. 179–83.

[3] For Matěj's treatment of free-will and predestination see : *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, I, p. 22 ; II, pp. 10–11, 171, 307 ; III, pp. 150–1 ; V, pp. 69–70, 247.

[4] See Odložilík, *M. Štěpán z Kolína*, pp. 41–2, and n. 165 on p. 68.

[5] Cf. *Regulae*, I, pp. 58, 62, 129, 133, 287 ; V, pp. 7, 162, 200.

[6] The whole question of Hus's view of spiritual lordship is discussed in Novotný and Kybal, *M. Jan Hus*, II, ii, pp. 380–401.

authority, an innovation which served to exalt the prestige and authority of the priest, the doctrinal basis of exaggerated sacerdotalism, which distinguished the priest as a perpetual worker of miracles, and therefore as different from the layman in kind as well as in degree. Against it he had brought the whole armoury of his realistic logic, pouring scorn on the neo-nominalists who had said "credo quia impossibile", condemning it as flouting the elementary axiom of logic that accidents cannot subsist even for a moment without a substance in which they could inhere. He had pursued his argument careless of consequences and had thereby forfeited all the support of those of his fellow-countrymen who had applauded his ecclesiastical but deplored his theological criticisms of the Church. But it is an abiding witness to the essential practicality of the Bohemian reformers and to their basic sacramentalism, that though one or two of them toyed as realist logicians with Wyclif's doctrine of remanence, they ended by rejecting it and maintaining complete eucharistic orthodoxy.

Long before Wyclif's doctrine of remanence reached Bohemia, the sacrament of the altar had become the palladium of the Bohemian reformers. Milíč, Vojtěch Raňkův,[1] Tomáš z Štítného, and above all Matěj z Janova had all advocated frequent communion of the laity, as being in the first place an ever-ready, all-sufficient, ineffably delectable means of grace, a constant source of spiritual refreshment. The recent practice of denying to the laymen the right to communicate more than once a year was regarded as a cruel usurpation of a most glorious and saving privilege, typical of the contumely and disdain of the priesthood. To Matěj the Eucharist is the very heart of his reform programme, it is his last and supreme rule drawn from the Scriptures for the restoration of true religion. To it he returns again and again. It is manna in the wilderness, it is the principle of life, sweet and delectable, a river of pleasure, it is alpha

[1] Cf. quotation from him in Matěj z Janova, *Regulae*, II, pp. 89, 90.

and omega, the beginning and the end. Matěj confesses that he wrote his whole great work to promote the honour and glory of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, to prompt others to the love and desire of it.[1] He insists that it should be given to all, laymen as well as priests, sinners as well as saints, who came to receive it.[2] His most eloquent contempt is poured on the heads of those priests who in their pride and cruelty would deny to laymen participation in the mystical union of the soul to Christ.[3] And such participation by the laity must be frequent; indeed his ideal and goal is daily communion.[4] And though Matěj never consciously took the final step Jakoubek ze Stříbra was to take, of demanding the chalice for the laity, the necessity therefor is implicit in all his reasoning, and on several occasions he seems vaguely to anticipate the whole fullness of Utraquism.[5] The whole of the fifth volume of the *Regulae* is devoted to extolling the virtues and expounding the lawfulness and necessity of that faith in the Eucharist which is perhaps the essence of the constructive side of the reform movement in Bohemia, both before and after Hus.

It is precisely here that the organic connexion between Hus and his compatriots, and his refusal to follow Wyclif blindly is most apparent. As Loserth himself admits,[6] Hus never erred in his orthodoxy in the matter of transubstantiation, never accepted Wyclif's doctrine of remanence.[7] More than that, the gradual publication of all Hus's works is making it ever more clear that Hus regarded the sacrament of the altar as Matěj had done, as the centre of the Christian life; he advocated communion of the laity, fre-

[1] *Regulae*, V, p. 35.
[2] *Ibid.*, I, p. 105; V, pp. 27–9, 36–7, 92–3.
[3] *Ibid.*, I, pp. 57, 59, 107; II, pp. 136; V, pp. 38, 78, 83, 143–4, 148, 171.
[4] *Ibid.*, II, p. 137; V, pp. 216–17, 218–19, 164–5.
[5] See Betts, R. R., in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1931.
[6] Loserth, *Huss und Wiclif*, pp. 189 ff.
[7] See for a full discussion of this, Novotný and Kybal, *M. Jan Hus*, II, iii, pp. 244–7.

quent communion, and the giving of the chalice to the laity.[1]

English Lollardy withered away largely because of Wyclif's difficult and unacceptable theology; it was made ineffective partly by his abstruse scholastic method, partly by the arid predestinarianism he inherited from Bradwardine, but chiefly by his premature attack on sacramentalism in general and transubstantiation in particular. The Bohemian reform movement of the fourteenth century survived and blossomed in the great national religious movement of the fifteenth, successful and permanent, precisely because Hus only adopted that in Wyclif which was congenial, which harmonised with the genius of Bohemia, and rejected all that was inapt and unsympathetic. Hus was a great and constructive religious genius, and the work which he effected, the national Church which he created, was not the outcome of principles he slavishly adopted from Wyclif, but the result of the blossoming to genius in him of those ideals which had long been germinating in his own country.

[1] See for a full discussion of this, Novotný and Kybal, *M. Jan Hus*, II, iii, p. 241. Hus, *Super Sent.*, pp. 580–2.

THE LAST YEARS OF THE COURT OF STAR CHAMBER 1630–41[1]

(The Alexander Prize Essay)

By Henry E. I. Phillips, B.A.

Read 9 June, 1938

On 31 May, 1641, in the House of Commons, Edmund Prideaux, the member for Lyme Regis, reported the findings of the Committee on the Star Chamber in a Bill for the abolition of that Court.[2]

There was at once a commotion. Before the Speaker had an opportunity to put the question for the engrossment of the Bill, Mr. Coventry, member for Evesham, rose to his feet to complain that the Committee had exceeded the bounds of its prescribed duty in bringing in such a Bill. Sir Robert Hatton thereupon desired that the original instruction for committal might be read, and, on this being done, it was found that Coventry was correct.[3] On the previous 1 April, a Bill for the " Reforming of the unlawful Proceedings " of the Court had been given its second reading. It was consigned to the Standing Committee on the Star Chamber. But, on the day following, the Committee

[1] I desire to express my grateful thanks, in the first place to Professor J. E. Neale, of the University of London, for the invaluable assistance and advice with which he has always been ready to guide my researches, and secondly to Mr. J. F. Mathias, B.A., of Yale University, with whom I have had many valuable conferences, and whose help in the preparation of this Essay for the press I have greatly appreciated.

[2] *Commons' Journals,* II, p. 162.

[3] This account is taken from the manuscript diary of the Long Parliament by Sir Simonds D'Ewes in the British Museum. Harleian MS. 163, f. 635.

was ordered to take into its consideration another Bill, which had not yet received a second reading and which had been introduced to the House on 26 March.[1] This was a Bill for "Declaring and Regulating the Power" of the Star Chamber. The Committee was moreover instructed to make one good bill out of the two.[2]

Mr. Coventry was supported in his complaint by a certain Mr. Vahun, who is most probably Mr. Vaughan, the member for Carmarthen,[3] and he too emphasised the fact that the House had originally intended the regulation, not the abolition of the Court. It was now the turn of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, who had been a member of the Committee.[4]

> If the order were generall [he said] to make one good bill out of two and the irregularities of the Court had been soe extreame as that could mee [*sic*] noe moderatinge of them, then the Committee must either have extinguisht and abolisht the Court or they could never have performed the order by making a good bill.

This artless excuse seems to have satisfied the House. D'Ewes records no further speeches on the subject; and the Commons proceeded to vote the engrossment of the Bill as it stood. It was read the third time on 8 June.[5]

Thus it was in these two months in Committee that the fate of the Court was finally decided. Is it possible to assign a reason for the taking of this extreme step? D'Ewes does not appear to have kept minutes of the proceedings of the Committee; we cannot, therefore, venture even a guess in this matter. Yet a possible clue is provided by Clarendon.

[1] *Commons' Journals*, II, p. 113.

[2] *Ibid., idem*, p. 115.

[3] The constituencies represented by the Members of Parliament concerned in this scene are to be found in *Return of Members of Parliament*, I, pp. 488, 496, 498.

[4] The Committee had been appointed on the 3rd December, 1640. *Commons' Journals*, II, p. 44.

[5] *Ibid., idem*, p. 171.

The account as set down in D'Ewes's Diary differs from that given by Clarendon in one important respect. According to the latter, the Bill, as originally committed, was reported to the House with certain amendments. Upon which,

> it was suddenly suggested (by a person not at all inclined to confusion, or to the violent party that intended that confusion), "that the remedies provided by that bill were not proportionable to the diseases; that the usurpations of that court were not less in the forms of their proceedings, than in the matter upon which they proceeded; insomuch that the course of the court (which is the rule of their judging) was so much corrupted, that the grievance was as much thereby, in those cases of which they had proper connusance, as it was by their excess in holding pleas of that, in which, in truth, they had no jurisdiction . . ."

Clarendon then goes on to say that the Bill was re-committed by the House, with an order that it should be so amended as to take the Court away entirely. Thus the Bill as eventually passed received only one reading.[1]

D'Ewes was a day-by-day reporter of Commons proceedings, whereas Clarendon was writing after the event, and the word of the former is thus the more credible. Yet the student is loath to condemn the interesting speech which Clarendon quotes.

Can the two interpretations be reconciled? Both versions agree that the Bill, as finally passed, received only one reading in the Commons. D'Ewes blames this on the Committee, Clarendon on the House. It is quite possible that Clarendon was confused; indeed, the two dates given in the margin against his description of the Parliamentary proceedings, 30 March and 2 April, are respectively the days for the first reading of the second Bill, and of the instruction to the Committee to take over the earlier Bill also. It may be conjectured that the speech by the member, about whose identity Clarendon weaves a wholly

[1] *The History of the Rebellion* (ed. W. Macray, 1888), I, p. 374.

irritating and quite unpenetrable circumlocution, was made in Committee, and not in the full House.

Nevertheless, two facts emerge. First, the Star Chamber was abolished by proceedings that were as unusual as they were precipitate. Secondly, its irregularities had been extreme. The latter conclusion is expanded in the Preamble to the final Act, which indicts the judges of the Court for not limiting the jurisdiction of the Star Chamber to the points laid down in the Act "Pro Camera Stellata" of Henry VII. They have "undertaken to punish when no harm doth warrant and to make decrees for things having noe such authoritie and to inflict heavier punishments than by any Law is warranted."[1] To the opinion of D'Ewes and to that of Clarendon's anonymous orator we are now able to add the official expression of opinion as enunciated by a common lawyer such as Prideaux, the leading light on the Star Chamber Committee.[2]

These various opinions have been accepted too much at their face value by later historians of the Court. During the period under review, the historian tends to proceed by strides from one outstanding case to another, with scarce a glance at what lies between. Even Gardiner is not entirely guiltless in this matter. But Gardiner was writing a general history of the period; he was moreover seated on the daïs of Liberty, watching and encouraging the less fortunate men of all epochs in their struggles to attain freedom. The outstanding cases were repugnant to his sensibilities; and, as he did not set out to write a history of the Court of Star Chamber, the many other cases that occupied its attention were not of interest to him.

G. M. Trevelyan, however, a successor of Gardiner in the historiography of the period under consideration, does admit, albeit rather grudgingly, that "a careful study of

[1] *Statutes of the Realm*, V, p. 110.

[2] He was the spokesman of the Commons in later conferences with the Lords on the subject of the Star Chamber Bill. Cf. D'Ewes's Diary, ff. 747, 748*v*.

the non-political cases in the Star Chamber in the time of Charles I shows good work being done by an unnecessarily powerful instrument of State." [1] It is perhaps a pity that the author does not define his term "non-political", and that his remarks seem to be based almost entirely upon the reports of cases in 1631–2, which his predecesssor had so ably edited and published for the Camden Society.[2] Trevelyan, however, like Gardiner, was more intent on fitting the Court into the more general picture of Stuart despotism.

Miss Elfreda Skelton is the most recent authority on the Court. There is as yet no published work to her account; but her thesis on the Elizabethan Star Chamber, which is deposited at the University of London, is invaluable.[3] She shows quite conclusively that the Court was not only beneficial in the sixteenth century, but that it was also popular. But even she, visualising only the outstanding cases in the later period, seems quite convinced that under the Stuarts the Court deteriorated to the extent that it became a mere instrument of tyranny.

It is of course essential to examine the outstanding cases, and to dwell upon the cruel judgments therein; it is equally necessary to determine exactly what were the causes at issue in these cases; but completely to ignore the many other cases which occupied the Court's attention during this period is to do less than justice to the subject. What must be determined is whether the outstanding cases are the exception or the rule in the annals of the Court. Once this is done, it will be possible to attempt a resolution of the intriguing problem set by the action of the Long Parliament.

[1] *England under the Stuarts*, p. 165.

[2] S. R. Gardiner, *Reports of Cases in the Courts of Star Chamber, and High Commission* (Camden Soc., 1886).

[3] Elfreda Skelton (now Mrs. J. E. Neale): "The Court of Star Chamber in the reign of Elizabeth," 1931, available at the Institute of Historical Research, London.

At first sight, a consideration of the proceedings of the Court between 1630 and 1641 seems an almost impossible task. The Public Record Office has not been able to calendar more than twenty-six sets of proceedings for the years 1625–41, as against nearly ten thousand for the reign of James I. But there are happily other aids. The State Papers Domestic in the Public Record Office can boast of a good collection of cause-lists, originally the property of Secretary Windebank, who has, more often than not, added some invaluable notes.[1] There are also the less official reports, of which many figure among Rushworth's *Historical Collections*.[2] Others are to be found in manuscript form, and two of these have been admirably transcribed by Gardiner for the Camden Society.[3] Official records are also available in the shape of the various Receipt Books of the Exchequer and the Memoranda Rolls for a study of the fines imposed by the Court.[4]

[1] The cause-list, presumably drawn up by one of the clerical officials of the Court, contains the names of all the plaintiffs and defendants in each hearing set down for the day. In addition, there is always added a brief statement of the cause at issue. Windebank's notes are in the form either of marginalia or of addenda on an attached sheet. These important documents are to be found in the following volumes of the State Papers Domestic for Charles I (P.R.O. Ref. S.P.16). Arabic numerals are used for convenience. Vols. 159, 167, 224, 225, 231, 239, 242, 248, 250, 251, 259–60, 266–7, 275–7, 283, 299–302, 314, 320–1, 344–6, 361–2, 369–70, 372, 379–81, 388–9, 391, 420, 443, 461, 535 *passim*.

[2] To be found either in Vol. II or in the Appendix to Vol. III. It should be noted in this connexion that Rushworth is not always very accurate. The Attorney-General's case against Overman and others, for using fish-oil in soap-making, is quoted in II, p. 252, as having been heard in the Trinity term of 1634. In III, App., p. 54, it is down under Easter 1633. The State Papers bear out the latter date as being the more correct. Cf. *Cal. S.P. Dom.*, 1633–4, p. 30.

[3] Reports are to be found for this particular period in the following British Museum manuscripts: Add. MS. 11764, ff. 1–29*v*., Harl. MSS. 4022 and 4130, Hargrave MSS. 404 (the reports begin at the back of this volume) and 489, ff. 9–15*v*. There are also reports in the following Bodleian manuscripts: Rawlinson MSS. A.128 and D.720 ff. 49*v*.–51. The two documents transcribed by Gardiner for the Camden Society are Harl. MS. 4130 and Rawl. MS. A.128.

[4] Fines, after review in the Star Chamber, would be estreated into the Office of the King's Remembrancer, and are therefore enrolled on the Memoranda Rolls. In the Auditor's Receipt Books of the Exchequer

Two other sources remain for comment. Neither has as yet been used in historical writing. Only two years ago there was presented to the Public Record Office a series of process books, formerly the property of the Clerk of the Writs and Processes, in which every writ issuing from the Star Chamber office has been meticulously entered.[1] The books are continuous from the middle years of Elizabeth's reign until the beginning of 1632. In the most tantalising manner they then stop, just when they might have shed a most important light upon the last years of the Court. They are, however, invaluable for the period which they do cover.

The second source is in the Bodleian Library. It is a book which is a most detailed report of each day's session in the Court, covering the period from the Hilary term of the twelfth year of Charles's reign to the Trinity term of the fourteenth year.[2] The writer has not contented himself with reporting the hearings of cases. He has also recorded so many motions and orders, even on the most trifling of subjects, that there is no ground for looking upon his reports as being in any way selective. They can therefore be considered as forming a record of unusual importance.

Many treatises on the Court are extant. William Hud-

(P.R.O. Ref. E.401), each auditor has a heading "Star Chamber Fines." I am much indebted to Mr. Mathias for drawing my attention to these most valuable sources of information.

[1] Presented by Sir Giles Sebright, Bt., a descendant of Thomas Saunders, Clerk of the Writs and Processes, 1631–41. The P.R.O. Class No. is G.D.38. The books appear to have been compiled as follows. A warrant for process would be issued by the Clerk of the Council to the Clerk of the Writs and Processes. The latter would make out the requisite writ and either enter up a record in his book at the time, or else allow warrants to accumulate until the end of the day when he entered them *en bloc*. (Cf. Hudson, *Treatise on the Court of Star Chamber* in F. Hargrave, *Collectanea Juridica* II, p. 47.) Every writ issued carried with it a fee, and accordingly the book could also be used as a check upon fees. The Public Record Office has indeed classified the volumes as Fee Books, but the title of Process Book is the more appropriate. Lists of fees exigible for the issuing of process are to be found in G.D.38/27(ii), or in Skelton, *op. cit.* I, Appendix, p. cxviii.

[2] Rawl. MS. C.827.

son and Isaac Cotton write at great length about the Star Chamber with which they were intimately connected. In addition, there is an anonymous book among the Harleian manuscripts entitled "A New Discovery of the Singular Jurisdiccon of the high Courte of Starre Chamber . . ." [1] All these treatises are of great value, and Hudson's work is particularly exhaustive.[2]

With all these sources at command, it is now possible to consider the various questions arising out of the Parliamentary action of 1641. The alleged differences of procedure and extensions of purview may be examined, while it will also be possible to determine whether excessive punishments were the rule or the exception during the last years of the Court.

For matters of procedure, reliance has to be placed on the contemporary treatises. But Cotton and Hudson were both writing in the later years of the reign of James I, and therefore not far away from the period under discussion, while the "New Discovery" appeared in 1636. An examination of the proceedings of the period is not, therefore, calculated to reveal much that does not appear in these works. The process books, however, and the pamphlet literature of the later period are quite illuminating in this matter, and, from an examination of these sources, it is possible to observe three general tendencies which lend colour to possible differences of procedure in the last years of the Court.

The first is, perhaps, the least impressive of the three, because its resolution must remain in the realm of conjecture. Yet it is of very great interest, for it concerns the discrepancy which exists between the number of cases initiated during the period of a single year, and the number

[1] There are numerous manuscript copies of Hudson in private hands as well as in public repositories. It has also been printed in F. Hargrave: *Collectanea Juridica*, Vol. II. A copy of Cotton's Treatise is in Lansdowne MS. 639. The "New Discovery" is in Harl. MS. 6448, and has also been transcribed by Miss Skelton, *op. cit.*, I, pp. xli, *et seq.*

[2] Miss Skelton has made a careful examination of the copies of Hudson in the British Museum, and has noted some discrepancies. *Op. cit.*, I, p. 6.

of cases eventually brought to a hearing. This can scarcely be looked upon as a feature peculiar to the Stuart period, but what had been perhaps a grave difficulty in the latter years of Elizabeth must have become wellnigh an impossibility under James and Charles. The number of cases heard during the course of a single year averaged rather less than fifty.[1] There might be as many as fifteen during the course of a single term, as in the Easter term of 1634.[2] But, on the other hand, the Bodleian manuscript gives evidence of the amazing fact that only twenty-four cases received a hearing in the four terms commencing with the Easter term of 1637, a year which was exceptional in that twenty-seven of its sitting days were occupied by three outstanding cases.[3] As against these figures, we have the indisputable fact that the number of cases initiated was steadily increasing. Miss Skelton was able to list 732 cases as having entered their first stages during the forty-fourth year of Elizabeth.[4] The process book, which covers the second regnal year of Charles, gives evidence that the number of plaintiffs initiating procedure during the course of a single year had increased to a thousand, and, by the seventh year of the reign, had increased still further. Moreover, a careful investigation over a period of six years ending with the Trinity term of the eighth year of the reign discloses the fact that scarcely four per cent of the cases initiated in the Court arrived at a hearing, while only twenty per cent appear to have advanced at all beyond the earliest stages.[5]

[1] This figure is obtained by computing the number of entries of writs *ad audiendum judicium* in the Process Books over a period of several years.

[2] Harl. MS. 4022.

[3] Rawl. MS. C.827. The three cases were Lord Mohun *v.* Sir James Bagg, which occupied nine days, Attorney-General *v.* Bishop Williams, which took up ten days, of which seven were in vacation, and Attorney-General *v.* Lord Saville, which required eight days of the Michaelmas term.

[4] *Op. cit.*, pp. 196, 197.

[5] The number of plaintiffs is obtained by computing the number of entries of writs *ad comparendum*. A large number of the entries have *ren* or *vet* entered against them. Experiment shows that these terms

The question that one is tempted to ask is whether the Stuarts had devised any particular procedure to meet this enormous increase in the business of the Court. When Bills lapsed in their early stages, this was due, more often than not, to a failure to proceed on the part of the plaintiff. But it is also just possible that the attorneys of the Court had a certain control in the matter. It is Hudson who tells us that the Lord Keeper delegated a certain power of selection to the attorney in charge of the case,[1] and it is conceivable that so powerful an officer would be in a position to compound cases in order to save their Lordships the trouble of sitting at times other than on their normal Wednesday and Friday during term-time. That cases were compounded is also apparent from a remark by Thomas Saunders in his " Rules for my Clerkes on taking fees," a document which is to a certain extent a key to the Process Books and which is preserved with them.[2] He exhorts his

signify that the particular writ was being renewed, or that it was a writ to another defendant in a case where one warrant for *subpœna* had already been issued. Such entries have therefore been discounted. It was possible for the plaintiff to issue several other writs, e.g. *ad reiungendum replicacioni* and to sue out various commissions, e.g. *ad examinandum testes*, before the definitive writ *ad audiendum judicium* was issued. It is on an examination of the entries of these later writs that the percentages in this section are based. Mr. Mathias, who has been using these process books in a period anterior to that covered by the present Essay, is in substantial agreement with me over the evidence forthcoming from this important source and over the method of using the books to obtain that evidence.

[1] Hudson expresses himself in this matter as follows: " . . . *lord Egerton*, conceiving that the attorneys best knew the client's cause, gave liberty to them to prefer such causes as their clients which most urged them, which were most earnest, and solicited them to prefer ; and those, after the cause required by the king's attorney, were always set to hearing. But because it is his [the Lord Keeper's] charge to set fitting causes for the lords judgment, he many times required those which were of counsel in the cause upon whose judgment he durst rely, to certify him whether the cause were fit to be heard . . ." *Collectanea Juridica*, II, p. 216. Hudson goes on to say that the attorneys seldom used their power to decide on the fitness of cases, because, provided that a case were heard, a fine could always accrue to the King, payable by the plaintiff if the hearing were dismissed. Nevertheless this important privilege presumably still remained.

[2] P.R.O., G.D. 38/27 (ii).

deputies to "enquire in the Star Chamber office with the deputy or Register when anie case is compounded."

This, however, must remain a conjecture, but, if it be accepted that the majority of suits were disposed of before they had an opportunity to reach a hearing, it is easy to explain one of the more puzzling features in the history of the Court, namely the absence of contemporary criticism of the Star Chamber on the grounds of undue delays between the inception of a suit and the hearing of a cause.

The second tendency to be observed is in the prosecution of Crown suits. Miss Skelton suspects that, in the time of Elizabeth, the Attorney-General's cases were given precedence no matter how many other suits were pending.[1] During the period under discussion, this is certain. On 13 November, 1633, the Crown's case against Lodovick Bowyer, for libelling the Archbishop of Canterbury, was heard,[2] although it does not appear upon a list of causes to be heard during that particular term ;[3] nor does a case, heard on the 16 October, in which the Attorney-General sued Richard Coxe for transporting forty tons of fuller's earth.[4] But the Crown, in certain cases, did more than hasten the hearing ; it also tended to abuse its privilege of procedure by *ore tenus*. Normally, it was allowed to proceed thus only *super confessionem*, if the defendant confessed, or *pro confesso*, if he persistently refused to answer the information laid against him. The answers of Burton, Bastwick and Prynne, in 1637, were all, on various

[1] *Op. cit.*, I, p. 96, and cf. passage from Hudson, quoted p. 112, note 1.

[2] S.P. Dom. Charles I, ccl, 58.

[3] *Ibid,*. ccxlvii, 66. There are two such documents among the State Papers, the other being in ccxci, 123. They are examples of the terminal cause-list. It would seem that a long list, in this particular instance amounting to fifty-three cases, would be drawn up prior to the Michaelmas term, and that this would be worked off in the shortest possible time, not necessarily during the particular term. The *ore tenus* cases would not appear on such a list, but would be taken as soon as they arose. The second of these two documents is, however, a cause-list for the Trinity term, and the assumption here would be that the cause-list for the preceding Michaelmas had been worked off.

[4] *Ibid.*, ccxlviii, 6.

pretexts, declared insufficient; they were not given a fair chance to remedy this before they were summarily arraigned.[1] Lilburne, in 1638, would not take the oath without being told the reason for his taking it. In his case also, the Attorney-General proceeded *pro confesso*.[2]

A third tendency which must now be observed is the Stuart practice of increasing the ecclesiastical representation on the bench of the Court. Elizabeth had been careful to allow only one bishop at a time to sit as a judge. During the period under discussion, there were three: the two archbishops and the Bishop of London, who, after 1636 in the person of Juxon, was also Lord Treasurer.[3]

Thus three tendencies can be discerned whereby Stuart procedure could be said to differ from that under the Tudors. The number of original writs of *subpœna* appears to be growing without a proportionate increase in the number of hearings. Again, and this is far more important, procedure by *ore tenus* was being abused. Finally, the ecclesiastical representation had increased markedly.

Is it now possible to discern any general tendency on the part of the Court either to inflict over-severe punishments or to deal with matters outside its competence? In order to examine this, it is necessary to piece together, not always very satisfactorily, the various fragments of evidence of its official proceedings.

The collation of the evidence to be gained from the State Papers with that obtained from the Bodleian manuscript,

[1] The answers had to be signed by one of the attorneys of the Court. Bastwick put in an unsigned answer. Prynne's answer was materially altered by the Attorney after it had been drafted. Prynne disowned the amended copy and the attorney refused to sign the original. Burton's answer was signed by attorney, but the Court declared a large portion of it to be scandalous. Burton refused to be examined upon what remained of his answer after the offending portion had been expunged. *A new discovery of the Prelates Tyranny in their late prosecutions of Pryn . . . Bastwick . . . and Burton . . .* (1641), pp. 27, 28, 40–5.

[2] *The Christian Man's Triall, or a true Relation of the first apprehension and several examinations of John Lilburne* (1641), pp. 6, 7.

[3] Rawl. MS. C.827 shows that the three ecclesiastics were frequent attenders at the Court.

from Rushworth, and from the other reports at our disposal, provides some interesting facts. From these sources it is possible to extract at least 308 cases as having been up for hearing in the Star Chamber between the sixth and the sixteenth years of the reign of Charles. In 284 of these cases the general nature of the cause at issue may be determined; while, on 236 occasions, there is some note about the judgment delivered.

An examination of the subject matter of these 284 cases gives some very striking results. One of the official reasons for the ultimate fate of the Court was that its competence had extended beyond the limits of the Act of Henry VII.[1] Miss Skelton, drawing on Hudson and on Coke for her theory, and on her own researches for her evidence, devotes a very interesting portion of her treatise to this very important question of jurisdiction. One emerges from a study of her conclusions with the feeling that, already by the end of Elizabeth's reign, the Court was almost omnipotent in cases involving violence, perjury, fraud, conspiracy, libel, oppression, official corruption and contempt of Proclamations.[2] Her figures, like those for the period under discussion, must not be taken absolutely at their face value. For there was scarcely a case in the Court that was not tried on two, three or more counts. Conspiracy might well be accompanied by riot, and supported by perjury; but, as such a case owed its inception to a charge of conspiracy, it is under this heading that it is listed. Miss Skelton's figures are more complete since every Bill that was put in during the period which was covered by her researches is available, whereas for the later period the facts are confined to the cases that were actually heard.[3]

[1] Professor Pollard has effectively disposed of any belief that this Act laid down any limits to the jurisdiction of the Court. *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, xxxvii, pp. 522 *et seq.*

[2] Miss Skelton gives a tabulated list of Bills filed in the forty-fourth year of Elizabeth. *Op. cit.*, I, pp. 196–7.

[3] Miss Skelton's figures throw an interesting light upon social history in the sixteenth century and upon the types of cases which were considered,

In no fewer than 334 out of her 732 cases in the forty-fourth year of Elizabeth's reign violent outrage was the main issue; out of the 284 cases between 1630 and 1640 in which the subject-matter of the cause is known, only sixty-six come exactly under this category. Where libel or scandal was the main issue, there are eighteen cases in the earlier year, forty-one in the later period; this represents a rise of nearly twelve per cent. Some five per cent of the total are assigned by Miss Skelton to the heading of fraud; during our period the proportion has risen to ten per cent. Only sixteen cases, or slightly over two per cent are traceable to a conspiracy in the Elizabethan year. During the Caroline period, there were fifty-three, that is eighteen per cent. But whereas there were ninety-six charges against corrupt officials among the cases for the earlier period, the percentage of such cases has dropped in the later period by as much as nine per cent, although it is fairly certain from the State Papers that between 1636 and 1641 many sheriffs were brought before the Court for refusing to levy ship-money.[1]

There remains one other class of cases for consideration. Between the sixth and the sixteenth years of Charles's reign, there were some seventeen cases arising out of contempt of royal Proclamations and Orders. Miss Skelton makes an interesting comment on this subject. "Extension of the jurisdiction," she says, "was possibly a factor making for the unpopularity of the Court under the Stuarts. Yet the widening of the scope of the Court was begun under Elizabeth. Contempt of proclamation was heard and punished here."[2] Proclamations against erecting buildings

in popular belief, worthy of the Court, rather than upon the cases which the Court itself deemed worthy of a hearing. In the latter connexion, figures based upon the actual hearings are more relevant. It is, therefore, with a certain diffidence that the two sets of figures are compared and percentages established, and the limitation should be borne in mind when they are being considered.

[1] E.g. *Cal. S.P. Dom.*, 1635, pp. 481, 498. The bill of the Attorney-General *v.* Lumley for such an offence is in Add. MS. 25266, ff. 21–48.

[2] *Op. cit.*, I, p. 144.

in London, against the engrossing of corn, against the cornering of tin and coal were all punished by the Star Chamber; so also was any abuse of the Proclamation against the printing of seditious literature. The increase from the two cases which Miss Skelton lists for the forty-fourth year of Elizabeth to the seventeen in the later period can be easily accounted for. The period under consideration is remarkable for the fact that during its course the country was virtually governed by Proclamations and Orders in Council. Nor is it possible to challenge the competence of the Court in the matter. An Order is made by the King in Council, very often by the Council after its judicial session in the Star Chamber. It is not surprising that the Council *qua* judicial body should devise and apply sanctions for its own legislative measures.

An examination of the subject-matter leads to two conclusions. First, the number of overt acts of violence was diminishing before a rise in the number of conspiracies and practices. This is well borne out in a statement by Bishop Williams during the course of a hearing in the Star Chamber in 1626. The Lord Keeper remarked that "whereas in ancient time the records of the Court are filled with battayles and ryotts soe outrageous whereas now wee here not of one in our age. The justice of this Court hath bin to lett justice flourish in her proper coloures & now our labour is only to suppresse those that bring grist to the mill, Conspirators and Barretors".[1] Williams was a little euphemistic, but his statement is none the less interesting.

The second conclusion is that the Court had a very wide jurisdiction and was the great rival of the Common Law Courts. The official reason for the abolition of the Court as embodied in the preamble to the definitive Act was an almost absurdly one-sided attempt by common lawyers of the calibre of Prideaux to restrict the activities of the Court to the terms of the Act of Henry VII.

It is now possible to turn to another charge which was

[1] Lansdowne MS. 620, f. 3*v*. (Star Chamber Reports 1–3, Charles I.)

levelled against the Star Chamber in its latter years, that it would be satisfied only with "cropped ears and slit noses," and that its fines were impossibly exorbitant.

It is a fact of extraordinary interest that out of our 236 known judgments during this period, only nineteen involved the corporal punishment of any of the parties to the suit. On seventy-five occasions a fine of more than a thousand pounds was imposed. Moreover no fewer than 109 cases were dismissed.

To find that more than sixty per cent of the undismissed cases involved a fine exceeding a thousand pounds seems rather startling; but it is the fact that very rarely did anyone pay the full amount. Twice a year, at the end of Hilary and Trinity terms, the fines came up for review.[1] They might be confirmed; they might be respited pending further consideration; or they might be mitigated. There are three very interesting documents among the State Papers which show how the system worked.

At the end of Hilary term, 1632 (O.S.),[2] four fines, imposed during the course of that term, came up for mitigation. In two cases, the fines were respited until the next day for mitigation; in another, fines of three hundred pounds were abated to sixty pounds, and fines of two hundred pounds to thirty pounds. In the fourth case, the fine was neither respited nor mitigated. It was confirmed. The same document records fines imposed in Michaelmas term, 1632, that is, since the previous day of mitigation. But it also records a fine imposed in Michaelmas term, 1629, and, in this particular case, Attorney-General *v.* Sir John Stowell, for assaulting and abusing a sheriff at an election, the fine of two hundred pounds was given a further respite. In fact, one gains the distinct impression that the Court purposely forbore to pronounce on fines. For the fines imposed in two cases heard during the Michaelmas Term of 1632, which are respited in this particular document, appear in

[1] "The New Discovery . . ." in Skelton: *op. cit.*, I, Appendix, p. lix.
[2] S.P. Dom. Charles I, ccxxxii, 43.

similar lists for mitigation drawn up at the end of Trinity term, 1637 and at the end of Trinity term, 1640.[1]

These particular cases were both at the suit of the Attorney-General, one against William Torkesey, and twelve others, for riotous destroying of the fen works in Lincolnshire, the second against William Steward and six others for riotous throwing down of enclosures in the forest of Feckenham. It is thus possible to see the Court withholding its judgment as a guarantee of the good behaviour of the defendants, an excellent device.

Not only were fines mitigated ; they were also pardoned or " estalled ". The State Papers give several examples of such royal pardons ; [2] while the entries in the books of receipt show exactly how common it was for fines to be paid in instalments. A typical half-yearly entry, selected at random from the Auditors' Receipt Book for Michaelmas 1641,[3] records the names of eight people, all of whom are paying instalments of their fines. One, Thomas Wright, is represented as paying thirty shillings in part payment of a fine of thirty pounds imposed in Trinity term, 1631. Moreover, in 1638, a certain John Wotton is still paying an instalment of a fine imposed in the fifth regnal year of James I ![4]

In the face of these facts it is hardly possible to sustain the generalisation that the Star Chamber habitually insisted on crushing fines. On the contrary the evidence suggests that the general, one might say average, tendency was in the direction of leniency.

Yet it must be admitted that occasionally the fines were crushing and were not respited. Burton, Bastwick and Prynne were fined five thousand pounds each in 1637, and their fines were neither mitigated nor respited until the Long Parliament quashed their sentences in 1641. John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, was fined ten thousand pounds ;

[1] S.P. Dom. Charles I, ccclxii, 103 ; cccclxi, 95.
[2] E.g. *ibid.*, cxciv, 22, 23 ; ccclxii, 103.
[3] P.R.O. Ref. E.401, 2466.
[4] P.R.O. Ref. E.401, 2460.

it was not respited. An interesting case is that where the City of London was cited for failure to carry out the terms of its charter in connection with the plantation of Ulster. A fine of seventy thousand pounds imposed in the Hilary term, 1634 (O.S.), was meant, according to Gardiner, to be pardoned, but, because twelve thousand pounds had already been granted to the Queen's use, some arrangement was come to whereby the City paid over the smaller sum directly to the Queen, and was pardoned the remainder.[1] The Exchequer therefore received nothing, but the fine remains the largest to be levied during the period under consideration.

Speaking generally, the insistence on heavy fines is as rare as the award of corporal punishment. One's first impressions of the Star Chamber are so greatly influenced by mental pictures of the whip and the hangman's knife that it is revealing to find that only nineteen out of the 236 cases involved corporal punishment. An analysis of these cases, interesting in itself, is essential to a due appreciation of the true position.

In the very first year of our period, Dr. Leighton was sentenced to

> be committed to the prison of the Fleet for life, and pay a fine of 10000 l., that the high commission should degrade him from his ministry ; and that then he should be brought to the pillory at Westminster while the Court was siting, and be whiped. After whiping, be set upon the pillory, a convenient time ; and have one of his ears cut off, one side of his nose slit, and be branded in his face, with a double S.S. for Sower of Sedition. That then he should be carried back to prison ; and, after a few days, be pilloried again in Cheapside ; and be there likewise whiped, and have the other side of his nose slit, and his other ear cut off ; and then be shut up in close prison, for the remainder of his life . . ." [2]

This sentence is quoted *in extenso* because it is at once a pattern for most of the outstanding cases of the period, and

[1] *History of England,* vii, p. 148 *n.*

[2] " Brief account of . . . treatment of . . . Leighton " in G. Benson : *Collection of Tracts,* pp. 220–21.

because it is the most ghastly of them all. The reader of the case is horrified ; the Long Parliament, to which Leighton addressed a petition, was moved to tears.[1] There is nothing that can excuse the appalling cruelty of the sentence and the ruthlessness with which it was carried out. Leighton was arraigned for publishing his book entitled *Sion's Plea against the Prelacie* in which he vituperated against bishops in general and Laud in particular. This dreadful censure was the price of his scandal of the episcopacy.

Another libel was heard in the following term. This time it concerned the Lord Keeper, and was instigated by one Bonham Norton.[2] His sentence is light in comparison : three thousand pounds fine to the King, and three thousand pounds damages to the Lord Keeper. He himself did not suffer corporal punishment. Two of his confederates, however, had their ears nailed to the pillory.

We descend the scale a little further in Hilary, 1630 (O.S.), when one Morgan, a Popish recusant, had to suffer for slandering two justices.[3] His fate was to lose his ears and pay a fine of one thousand marks. To libel an ordinary minister of the Church seems to have been an offence of even less importance. In Dalton cler. *v.* Beck, in Michaelmas, 1631, the defendant had to pay a trifling fine, and undergo a whipping.[4] Libels against ordinary folk never appear to have been punished by anything but a fine, although, if the libeller was himself a man of substance, the fine might be very heavy. Thus, in 1631, Sir Richard Greenvile was fined four thousand pounds for slandering the Earl of Suffolk.[5]

But anyone who dared to speak disrespectfully of Laud, the leading man of the time, or of his hierarchy, suffered for his temerity. On 13 November, 1633, Lodovick Bowyer was sentenced to a fine of three thousand pounds,

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 224.
[2] Rushworth, Appendix to Vol. III, p. 30.
[3] *Ibid., idem*, p. 33.
[4] *Ibid., idem*, p. 40.
[5] *Ibid., idem*, p. 43, and see Gardiner, *Reports of Cases . . .*, p. 108.

to life imprisonment, to lose his ears and to be stigmatised for publishing false tales and scandals about the Archbishop of Canterbury.[1] He was followed to a similar fate on 7 February by William Prynne, now appearing for the first time, who, by sneering at the Queen as well as at the episcopacy, laid himself open to severe censure.[2] Mephistosheth Robyns, appearing in Michaelmas term, 1634, selected the Archbishop of York as his particular butt and was ordered to pay one thousand pounds and undergo whipping.[3] John Bastwicke and Henry Burton joined Prynne in a more concerted outcry against the ecclesiastical system in 1637 and were summarily inflicted with all corporal punishments and a fine of five thousand pounds each.[4] John Lilburne, who, at the age of nineteen, had the temerity to publish books containing similarly seditious material, albeit published abroad, was perhaps spared by his age from the hangman's knife. He was nevertheless whipped.[5]

When it is found that William Pickering, in 1638, lost his ears for "speaking and publishing lewd and insolent speeches to the scandall of his Majestie and the true Religion established in this kingdom," libel appears to have a very general interpretation.[6] But no general interpretation was needed a week later when Sir Richard Wiseman was before the Court for slandering the Lord Keeper by accusing him of taking bribes.[7] Although his fine of ten thousand pounds was respited on the day for mitigation of fines at the end of Trinity term, 1640,[8] he had to pay prodigious sums of money in damages, was degraded from both knighthood and baronetcy, and deprived of his ears. All were treated alike who slandered men in high places.

[1] S.P. Dom. Charles I, ccl, 59 and Rushworth, *loc. cit.*, p. 65.
[2] Rushworth, II, pp. 220 *et seq.*
[3] *Ibid.*, *idem*, p. 269.
[4] *A brief relation of certaine speciall . . . passages . . . in the Star Chamber . . . at the censure of Bastwick . . . Burton . . . and Prynne . . .*, p. 32.
[5] Rushworth, II, p. 463.
[6] S.P. Dom. Charles I, cccxci, 85, and Rawl. MS. D.720, f. 49*v*.
[7] Rawl. MS. D.720, f. 49*v*.
[8] S.P. Dom. Charles I, cccclxi, 95.

Libel was not the only offence for which corporal punishment was deemed fitting. It was also used for conspiracy, and the remainder of the nineteen cases come under this heading. Conspiracy might range from the attempt of Dorothy Blackburn to accuse one Monk of treason, as a result of which he was sent unjustly to the rack,[1] to the case where a certain Baker falsely accused Sir Edward Seabright for the rape of his daughter.[2] The most notorious of such cases was where George Walker accused Freegift Stace of stealing wool. He was adjudged to lose his ears. Even Windebank is constrained to add the remark to his cause list: "the villanous Judgement".[3]

It is apparent, however, that the gravest censures were for libel, and that the gravest libels were those directed against the hierarchy of the Church.

It is now possible to draw together the various threads. Procedure under the Stuarts varied from that of former times, principally in those cases where the Attorney-General was the plaintiff, and then only when the defendants were charged with seditious libels against ministers of state or against the hierarchy of the Church. Jurisdiction in the time of the Stuarts cannot be said to have materially altered. But emphasis must be laid on the practice of taking special cognisance of offences against the Church. Finally, punishment, during the period under consideration, was, in the great majority of cases, by no means severe; yet in certain cases, which have been noticed, it was nothing short of ferocious.

It may be well said, therefore, that there was room for reform. It cannot, however, be averred that the court merited complete abolition. What has to be discovered is whether there was not some underlying tendency common to these cases which would make the Star Chamber especially unpopular.

[1] Rushworth, Appendix to Vol. III, p. 33.
[2] Hargrave MS. 404. The reports are at the back of this volume.
[3] S.P. Dom. Charles I, ccxlii, 35.

The pamphlet literature of the period gives the decided impression that there was such a deep-seated grievance.

Already attention has been drawn to the fact that the gravest censures of the Court were for libels against the Episcopacy. It was these cases, moreover, that represented a departure from precedent by the Court both in matters of procedure and in matters of purview. When Prynne suffered the first time, for his *Histrio-Mastix*, no one came to cheer him on the pillory. Yet when he and his friends suffered, three years later, for having libelled the bishops, a huge crowd assembled to give encouragement to them in their ordeal, and to listen to the words which fell from their lips.[1] The malefactor of 1634 had become the martyr of 1637.

It is "an ill-willer to the Romish brood" that translates this different atmosphere into words. In a pamphlet published in 1641, entitled *England's Rejoycing at the Prelate's downfall*, he expresses himself in no uncertain terms.

> Consider how most barbarously [he says] [the Bishops] persecuted God's people, in dismembring, and disfiguring and whipping, and Pilloring, and Fettering, and Imprisoning, and Banishing, and Silencing, &c. At first, in cutting off those Three Worthy mens Eares, Mr. Burton, Dr. Bastwicke and Mr. Pryn and then Fining them and Banishing them to Perpetuall Imprisonment, which was against the Laws of God and men. Ô it was most cruell dealing, not like Christians, but as dogs. And also good Dr. Layton that hath bin both branded and whipt, and his nose slit, and Imprisoned. And Mr. John Lilburne, that hath bin whipt and gagged, and Fettered, and Pillorisied, [*sic*] and Imprisoned. And so many others of Gods children did the Lordly Prelates prosecute and tyrannise over . . .[2]

Here at once the keynote is struck. The chord echoes and re-echoes throughout the sessions of the Long Parliament. It is to the bishops that the paramount objection

[1] Gardiner gives a good account in *History of England*, viii, pp. 231–3.
[2] *England's Rejoycing at the Prelate's downfall*, p. 5 of text.

is taken. Rushworth, in a short treatise, culled mostly from Hudson, remarks that "nothing would satisfie the revenge of some Clerymen but Cropt Ears, slit noses, branded Faces, whipt Backs, gag'd Mouths . . ." [1] His use of the word "clerymen" is significant. When W. H. Terry, in his *Life and Times of John Finch*, misquotes "members" for "clerymen," [2] he causes this significance to be lost.

There are many examples of the objection to the presence of bishops in the Star Chamber. "It is both against Gods Laws and mans," thunders Prynne, "that Bishops and Clergie should be Judges over any Subjects within this Realm, for it is no part of their office . . ." [3] Leighton's trial was the subject of another pamphlet. The title speaks for itself: *A brief account of Archbishop Lauds cruel treatment of Doctor Leighton.* In it is a statement of how "that pious, merciful, and truly Christian Bishop, Dr. Laud, pulled off his cap, when (the) horrible sentence was pronounced, and gave God thanks for it". [4]

One is beginning to sense more and more the presence of Laud. The treatment of John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, is illustrative of this. The bishop had succeeded to the Lord Keepership after the disgrace of Bacon, and had retained it up till 1626, when Charles I, by a device, got rid of him. The hand of Laud was in this. Later, Williams was brought before the Star Chamber for betraying official secrets, and, in his over-eagerness to prove his innocence, appears to have tampered with witnesses. It was on the latter count that he was fined ten thousand pounds in 1637. If Laud had done nothing else but introduce Kilvert to carry on the prosecution after the death of Attorney-General Noy, his attitude to Williams would have been obvious. For Kilvert, who really had no right to prosecute

[1] II, 475.
[2] W. H. Terry, *Life and Times of John Finch* (1936), p. 189.
[3] W. Prynne, *A Terrible Outcry against the Loytering exalted Prelates*, p. 3.
[4] P. 221.

a Crown case, was perhaps the most unscrupulous person ever to undertake a prosecution in the Court. He was well paid for his pains.[1]

Something of the almost universal fear of Laud is reflected in Prynne's speech from the pillory, in which he makes reference to Williams.

> I had thought [he says] they would have left alone those of their own Rochet and not have medled with any of their own Sacred Order. And yet the next (for ought I know) that is to follow us and receive a Censure in the Starre-Chamber, is like to be a Bishop. You see they spare none of what society or calling soever, none are exempted that crosse their owne ends. Gentlemen look to yourselves, you know not whose turn may be next.[2]

The hand of Laud was everywhere. In spite of his cloth, and in contradistinction to Williams when the latter, as Lord Keeper, had presided over the Court,[3] he thought nothing of the shedding of blood. His power was formidable. Elizabeth's decree against printing seditious books was revitalised at his command. He sat on the Board of Licensers in his dual capacity of Archbishop of Canterbury and Chancellor of Oxford University, controlling an additional vote on that board of four by his influence over the mild Juxon, and dragging all offenders into the Star Chamber or High Commission.[4] His membership of the Court before which such offenders were brought was never deemed incompatible with his deep interest in the matter at trial. After heavily inveighing against Prynne, he could, with seeming magnanimity, refrain from formally passing judgment—the influence of his presence sufficed. Windebank

[1] John Hacket, in his biography of Williams, *Scrinia Reserata*, is very bitter against Kilvert, whom he accuses of bribing witnesses and falsifying evidence, II, § 112. Even when due allowance has been made for Hacket's obvious prejudices, Kilvert still appears as a most unpleasant figure. There is a reference to the fact that he was paid fifteen hundred pounds for his services in *Cal. S.P. Dom.*, 1637, p. 356.

[2] *A brief Relation* . . . pp. 43, 44. [3] Cf. Hacket, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

[4] Cf. R. P. T. Coffin, *Life of Archbishop Laud* (1930), pp. 156–7.

was an appointee of his ; [1] Juxon also owed his position to the Primate.[2] Chief Justice Finch, later the Lord Keeper, was his friend. Richard Neile, Archbishop of York, was of the same circle.

Very interesting are some remarks by Bishop Williams in the margin of a copy of Laud's speech at the censure of Burton, Bastwicke, and Prynne.[3]

> All your life [he notes] is but a diversion from your calling. . . . This very act of yours to neglect all Christian mildness, and fall upon the killing and massacring of these poor flies in the Star Chamber, to draw malice and hatred upon all your coate and calling, was unto the Church of England a most unfortunate diversion . . .[4]

In another place, Williams refers to the severity of the sentences as bringing "scorn and contempt upon the Ministers, and a "generall odium upon the prelates of this Kingdome beside the universall resentment now conceived against the High Court of Starr Chamber ".[5] Now Williams does not say that the proceedings of the Court were without precedent or that its jurisdiction was too far extended ; nor does he say that the Court had outlived its usefulness. His remarks are concerned with the severity of the sentence, and he links this with the Archbishop. So did some person unknown, who, on 30 June, 1637, pasted a libel on the Cross in Cheapside "that the Archbishop had his hand in persecuting the Saints and shedding the bloud of the Martyrs ".[6] The saints and martyrs were more especially Burton, Bastwicke, and Prynne. It was as well for the perpetrator that his anonymity was not pierced.

[1] Laud's Diary, quoted in P. Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, p. 225.

[2] W. H. Marah, *Memoirs of Archbishop Juxon* (1869), p. 20.

[3] This speech was printed, with a foreword by Laud, at the command of Charles. Williams annotated his copy, and there is a copy of the speech in the British Museum, which has been printed together with these marginalia.

[4] P. 2. of Foreword.

[5] P. 6 of Foreword.

[6] From Laud's Diary, quoted in W. Prynne, *Breviate of the Life of Laud*, p. 21.

If it be objected that the greater part of the evidence examined above proceeds from biased sources and should be offset by evidence from the opposite side, the answer must be that the attempt is being made to assign a reason for the summary action of the Commons in 1641, and that that body was itself biased. It was as virulent in its attacks on the episcopacy as are any of the pamphlets which have been quoted. Without any compunction a Bill was prepared to remove bishops from their seats in the Upper House, a privilege as old as Parliament itself; to sweep them too from the Council board.[1] But this was not enough. Parliament, in its prevailing temper, was not a prop of the episcopacy; the Courts were. The High Commission went as a matter of course. The Star Chamber followed.

Indeed it was the misfortune of the latter Court often to be confounded with the Commission for Causes Ecclesiastical, a confusion which might nevertheless be called co-operation. The Star Chamber could convict John Traske, in 1618, for judaical practices;[2] it might logically be expected to arraign Theophilus Brabourne in 1634 and Mary Chester in 1635, who were accused of similar offences. Yet these cases went before the High Commission.[3] In return for the help of the Star Chamber in trying riot committed within the sacred precincts of a church,[4] the ecclesiastical body might relieve the secular court of some of its trials for offences against the committee for licensing books.[5] Prynne and Leighton were both in the first instances before

[1] *Commons' Journals*, II, p. 101.

[2] Cf. *Calendar of MSS. of Marquess of Bath* (Hist. MSS. Com.), II, p. 67.

[3] *Cal. S.P. Dom.*, 1634–5, p. 126; 1635–6, p. 32.

[4] The most outstanding example is the Attorney-General *v.* Henry Sherfield in February 1632 (O.S.) for riotous breaking of a stained glass window in St. Edmund's Church, Salisbury. He was fined five hundred pounds. This case is of especial interest in that the charge of riot seems to have been only the excuse for bringing Sherfield before the Star Chamber. He was really punished for an offence against the existing ecclesiastical system. *v.* Rushworth; II, pp. 152 *et seq.*

[5] Cf. *Cal. S.P. Dom.*, 1638–9, p. 213.

the High Commission; while it was often the custom of the Star Chamber to hand over clerics to the Commissioners so that they might be degraded prior to the execution of sentence.

And so the scene shifts again to the Parliament of 1641. One by one the great men of the Court vanished, if not by order of the Parliament, then through fear. One by one they disappeared, Windebank and Finch abroad, Laud into prison. Neile was already dead. Juxon, the mild Juxon, was left in peace. The Court simply fades away. The State Papers are almost empty of documents relating to it during the early months of the Long Parliament. Reports are absent, and the total of fines drops from close on two thousand pounds in 1640 to under one thousand pounds in 1641.[1]

During this time also, the Commons were considering the petitions of the "martyrs". Bastwicke was pardoned on 25 February, Burton on 24 March. But the cases of Prynne, Leighton, and Lilburne were all under review while the Committee was considering the Bill for regulating the Court. Lilburne, the last of them, received his pardon on 4 May.[2] Fresh from the examination of these causes, the Commons must have been very ready to administer the *coup de grâce* to the Star Chamber.

But the Lords were not so ready. In spite of Clarendon's assurance that the Bill passed easily,[3] contemporary evidence goes to show that the Peers wanted to retain the Court "with a limitation".[4] Indeed there were no fewer than three conferences between Lords and Commons on the subject.[5] The Lords quibbled on small points of terminology as if to gain time. Their attitude is extraordinary in

[1] F. C. Dietz, *Receipts . . . of the Exchequer*. Smith College Studies in History, xiii, no. 4, p. 213.

[2] *Commons' Journals*, II, pp. 92, 112, 124, 134.

[3] *Op. cit.*, I, p. 375.

[4] *Diurnall occurrences in Parliament* . . . p. 165 (28 June, 1641), and also in Add. MS. 36829, f. 38 (1 July, 1641).

[5] *Commons' Journals*, II, pp. 189, 194.

view of Lord Andover's speech in the Upper House which Rushworth quotes.[1] Andover's chief objection to the Court was that it was too dangerous to those in high places. Perhaps he was thinking of the information laid by the Attorney-General in 1635 against the Earl of Clare, Viscount Newark and many other men of standing, for residing in London contrary to the Proclamation against such an action.[2] But Andover was presumably the son of the Earl of Berkshire,[3] therefore a young man of twenty-five. It is easier, therefore, to picture him as one of a youthful minority than as representative of the feeling of the Upper House.

But the obstructionist policy of the Lords was of no avail. The Bill passed the Upper House on 2 July [4] in almost as strange circumstances as those in which it had already passed the Commons. In the various reports which are at our disposal, there is no mention of its having been passed, and, had we not the testimony of the Journals, we should be tempted to think that it had been shelved. The Act received the King's reluctant consent on 5 July.[5]

The sudden reaction against the Star Chamber may be considered a phase of the general movement against the episcopacy. Individuals might object to the sentences which they incurred in the Court ; lawyers might inveigh against its omnipotence ; but the power to punish can be limited, and competence may be restricted. The complete abolition of the Court argues a deeper enmity, a hatred which finds expression in the popular manifestations against the savage excesses with which ecclesiastical authority was wielded in temporal affairs. It is not far from the truth to say that the Star Chamber perished in a burst of fanatical frenzy.

[1] Rushworth, IV, p. 298.

[2] *Ibid.*, II, pp. 288 *et seq.*

[3] The Earl of Berkshire's eldest son was called by his father's second title, Viscount Andover. But he was summoned to Parliament, during his father's lifetime, as Lord Howard of Charlton. G.E.C. *Complete Peerage*, II, p. 151. No doubt he continued to be known as Lord Andover.

[4] *Lords' Journals*, IV, p. 298. [5] *Ibid., idem*, p. 299.

For the Court was really serving a purpose. D'Ewes, in his reply to Coventry in the House on 31 May, had been careful to add to his comment that they had really destroyed only a branch of the Council table, which itself would still remain.[1] Hacket seems quite surprised at its fate. "I am not so bold with Providence, to determine why God caused or permitted this great Court to be shut up like an unclean place; or why Divine judgment was so severe against their persons especially that inflamed the censure against our Bishop . . ." [2] He adds "a Pot that boils over may be taken from the fire and set on again . . .," a beautifully expressed sentiment which Clarendon re-echoes: "the taking it away was an act very popular; which, it may be, was not then more politic, then the reviving it may be thought hereafter, when the present distempers shall be expired." [3]

It is Sir Philip Warwick who tells us a delightful story, for which we have only his authority. The absence of the Court, it appears, prompted Judge Hales "to say quite openly at an Assize at Cambridge (as a Gentleman of great quality, who was then on the Bench, assured me), that he believed since the pulling down of that Court, there had bin in few years more perjuries and frauds unpunished, than there had bin in an hundred years before." [4]

The Star Chamber did not pass unmourned.

[1] D'Ewes's Diary, Harl. MS. 163, f. 635.
[2] J. Hacket, *Scrinia Reserata*, II, p. 120.
[3] *Op. cit.*, I, p. 375.
[4] Sir Philip Warwick, *Memoirs of the Reign of King Charles*, 1702, p. 175.

FOX'S MARTYRS; THE GENERAL ELECTION OF 1784

By Mrs. Eric George, M.A., Litt.D., F.R.Hist.S.

Read 11 *November*, 1937

It is on opinion only that Government is founded, and this maxim extends to the most despotic and most military government as well to the most free and most popular.

—Hume.

The story of the overthrow of Fox and North has often been told. Since the publication of the papers of John Robinson [1] it has been very generally held that public opinion did not express itself at the 1784 election to any great degree. Professor Laprade pillories the view that Pitt was carried into power by a frenzied wave of popular hostility to the Coalition as the incorrect view of every historian from Lecky to Dr. Rose.[2] The landslide theory was indeed unquestioned till the publication of Robinson's papers. Since then it has been generally dismissed.[3] In fact, some writers have accepted the popular hostility theory without consideration of the circumstances of an eighteenth-century election; they were naturally taken for granted by contemporaries to whom they were all too familiar. It is

[1] *Parliamentary Papers of John Robinson*, 1774–1784, ed. W. T. Laprade, 1922.

[2] "William Pitt and Westminster Elections," *American Hist. Rev.*, xviii, pp. 253–74.

[3] "The investigation which has been made into the preparations, calculations, and attitude of John Robinson . . . proves that little, if any, consideration was given to the effect which the views of the electors on any of the public questions of the day might have on the election results. Interest was of much greater importance." C. S. Emden, *The People and the Constitution*, 1933, p. 197.

the thesis of this paper that those who have accepted the views of Professor Laprade have fallen into a similar error from an opposite angle. The belief that the election of 1784 was different in kind from other pre-Reform elections is not of course tenable. The parliament of 1761 was "chosen" by Newcastle, that of 1780 by North.[1] A ministry supported by the Crown could be certain of a majority by the purchase of boroughs in cash or patronage or by Treasury support to ministerial candidates. At least equally potent was the desire of candidates and their constituents to be on the side of the loaves and fishes.

It is also true that the Ministry were always concerned with the state of opinion on the eve of an election,[2] and that members were anxious to conciliate their constituents.[3] Robinson's estimate, made before the defeat of the India Bill, is naturally concerned with the results to be got from negotiation and purchase: it was not his business to discuss the state of opinion, which moreover had not then declared itself. And, before dismissing the "frenzied hostility" theory, it is worth considering why it was so firmly held by contemporaries, who were well aware, not only of the conditions of an election, but of Robinson's activities, which were the subject of popular prints and newspaper paragraphs.[4] For instance Burke, retrospectively defending the India Bill, said in 1788:

[1] A parliament "chosen by Lord North and occasionally filled by Mr. Fox." Buckingham, *Courts and Cabinets of George III*, 1853, i., p. 304. For 1761 see Namier, *England in the Age of the American Revolution*, 1930, pp. 153 ff.

[2] Cf. a letter from Newcastle to Lord Irwin, patron of the borough of Horsham, 11 June, 1747: "Upon all considerations it has been determined to call a new Parliament immediately the Session is ended. The Nation is now in a good humour, no accident has yet happened to make them otherwise, since the happy extinction of the rebellion, and therefore I verily think we cannot fail of getting a good whig Parliament." Quoted, Albery, *Parliamentary History of Horsham*, 1921, p. 88.

[3] Porritt, *Unreformed House of Commons*, 1909, i, pp. 267 ff.

[4] See below, p. 157. Wraxall, who is explicit, and remarkably well-informed, about Robinson's services, is also emphatic as to the landslide character of the election. *Memoirs*, 1884, iii, pp. 236, 331–8.

The people at that time were unfortunately infatuated, deceived, hurried on to madness to the overthrow, to the destruction, of the high priest of their liberties, when exerting himself at the public altar in their support. The leaders of that mob were a thousand times worse than Lord George Gordon, now suffering in his Jewish gaberdine. Had his mob destroyed the Bank, the country's wealth might have rebuilt it : had they destroyed St. Paul's Cathedral, the piety of the nation would have rebuilt it : but the mob of 1784 destroyed the House of Commons, destroyed their best friends . . .[1]

But still more weight has been given to the fact that only in a few constituencies did candidates " have to submit to so much as formal opposition at the polls." Now opposition at the polls, in large constituencies at least, was never formal, it was opposition at the last ditch when a decision could be reached in no other way. Professor Laprade takes the returns in Stooks Smith [2] and estimates that there were 71 unsuccessful candidates in 1768, 113 in 1774, 92 in 1780, 107 in 1784, and 96 in 1790.[3] These figures do indeed give a remarkable result : contests (so-called) were at a maximum in the interval of political apathy between the Wilkes crises and the heats of the American War. Such calculations, I suggest, are trebly fallacious. First, a contest in a tiny borough is equated with one in Middlesex or Westminster. Secondly, it is forgotten that after the Grenville Act (surely the true cause of the rise in 1774) contests were more than ever undertaken, not on political grounds, but to establish an interest, so that contests in boroughs were often mere preliminaries to an election petition. Thirdly, the criterion of a contested election is contrary to eighteenth-century practice, leaving aside the further point—that it is hard to see why an election in which one side is in a clear majority reflects opinion less than one where the issue is doubtful : contemporaries were impressed when Foxites declined the poll.

[1] *Parl. Hist.*, xvii, p. 134.

[2] *The Parliaments of England from George I to the Present Time*, 3 vols., 1844–50.

[3] " Public Opinion and the General Election of 1784," *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xxxi, 1916, pp. 224–37.

The returns in Stooks Smith fall into three classes. First, where votes are recorded, the only ones regarded by Professor Laprade as contests. Second, where the names of the unsuccessful candidates are given in italics, as in the famous Yorkshire election of 1784, when the Foxites withdrew after being in a hopeless minority at the county meeting, on Nomination Day, and on their canvass.[1] If not a contest it was a signal victory: "The triumph in Yorkshire is a great one," wrote Cornwallis.[2] In the third class are elections apparently uncontested because the names of the candidates returned only are given. But no one can read eighteenth-century correspondence without coming across instances of heated canvassing and doubtful issues, which, on reference to Stooks Smith, are found to be in class III.[3]

This assumption of no contest, and therefore no defeat, without polling is inconsistent with contemporary election practice and with eighteenth-century estimates of elections. According to the *Annual Register* "upwards of 160 candidates lost their seats" in 1784.[4] Wilberforce estimates nearly 200 victories besides Yorkshire.[5] The pamphlet called *Fox's Martyrs* enumerates 97 Foxites who lost the seats they had held in the last parliament; the list does not seem to be complete [6] and a few were defeated more than once, or having been defeated got in for a close

[1] B.M. Add. MSS. 28,060, ff. 121–2.

[2] *Correspondence*, ed. Ross, 1844, i, p. 165. See below, p. 167.

[3] For instance, the by-election for Staffordshire in 1799. *Private Corr. of Lord Granville Leveson Gower*, 1917, i, pp. 242–4. An election at which Sir E. Impey was defeated for Stafford after violent electioneering is untraceable in Stooks Smith. See E. B. Impey, *Memoirs of Sir Elijah Impey*, 1846, p. 350. Wilberforce excused himself in 1806 to a correspondent on the ground that "a contested election for Yorkshire finds a candidate in abundant employment for tongue, legs, and pen." But this election is in class III. Lascelles had withdrawn on account of his unpopularity with the clothiers. *Life of Wilberforce*, 1838, iii, p. 285.

[4] *Ann. Reg.*, 1784, p. 147.

[5] *Life*, i, p. 64.

[6] Two Foxites disappeared from Leicester: Macnamara, the senior new member, was a strong Pittite; Charles Loraine Smith is known to history only as an amateur artist (for sporting subjects).

borough. In the new parliament there were actually 147 members who had not sat in the last one, and there were of course unsuccessful new candidates—for instance, Tarleton at Liverpool and John Crewe at Chester—who, though defeated, do not appear among the "Martyrs." The rejected therefore include those who did not venture to stand, those who withdrew before the election, either after an advertisement which did not evoke the hoped-for support, or after an unfavourable canvass, or after inadequate support on Nomination Day, as well as those who were beaten at the election. These last include those who presented themselves at the place of election with their chief supporters but were in such a minority that they did not venture to demand a poll as well as those who polled and were defeated.[1]

The basis of these contemporary estimates—the numbers of those who failed to secure re-election—shows how strong was the sense that the sitting member should be undisturbed.[2] The same criterion of the influence of opinion on elections, the extent of the change in the composition of the House, was that of Fox in 1797, in a famous speech on Grey's motion for Reform. He demonstrated the lack of such influence in 1780 by pointing out that the new House was much the same as that which it replaced, forgetting his claim for this very parliament in 1784.[3] It is, however, remarkable that in 1780 there were 144 new members as compared with 147 in 1784 and 145 in 1790—like 1774 a time of political quiet.[4]

Conclusions from the returns in Stooks Smith thus appear

[1] Cf. Namier, *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III*, i, pp. 196–7. A Yorkshire squire wrote to Carmarthen on the eve of Nomination Day: "I am endeavouring as much as I possibly can to make as respectable and numerous a meeting to-morrow in hopes that a Resignation may take place when the opposing party see themselves a second time in so *pitifull* a Minority." Add. MSS. 28,060, fo. 121.

[2] See below, pp. 154–5.

[3] See below, p. 148.

[4] These figures are obtained from the annual *Royal Kalendar* ("Red Book") in which the names of members who did not sit in the previous parliament are printed in italics.

to have little validity, and deductions from the mere statistical turnover at a general election, though contemporary, are not much more satisfactory. It is here that Robinson's Papers are of great value, for they enable us to compare his expectations with the results. But before examining them the preliminaries of the election must be considered—the excited state of popular feeling. It has been suggested on the strength of the election addresses for Westminster and Norfolk that the political issue was not put before the constituents.[1] But such addresses were common form :[2] the points at issue, and much else, were to be found in the bills and advertisements which covered the walls and filled the newspapers. The Westminster election, however, for very good reasons, was fought almost entirely on personalities.[3] In Norfolk, Coke stood on his personal connexions and stake in the county ; his opponent's address was political. The election of 1784 differs from others of the century in the nature and extent of the publicity campaign which preceded and accompanied it : public meetings all over the country to vote addresses to the Crown, pamphlets and election literature of a type then rare in that it was concerned with general and not local issues.[4] Besides this, there was a mass of satirical prints and caricatures, widely circulated and admitted by Fox to have been highly damaging.

And, it may be asked, why were the Foxites so confident in January and even in February, when the nature of Treasury influence in elections was so well known ? Their miscalculations are not the less odd when it is remembered that during the Regency crisis they counted on office, not-

[1] C. S. Emden, *op. cit.*, pp. 182, 197.

[2] Cf. Burdett's election address of 1812, in which he speaks of "the hacknied style of congratulation and profession usual on occasions like the present." M. W. Patterson, *Sir F. Burdett and his Times*, 1931, i, p. 321.

[3] See Westminster election prints in B.M. *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires*, vi, 1938, and *History of the Westminster Election*, 1784. See also below, p. 153.

[4] Cf. Lord Holland, *Memoirs of the Whig Party*, ii, p. 226.

withstanding the Prince's restricted patronage. Surely because they did not anticipate the wave of popular feeling which strengthened Pitt's hand. The King's action, supported only by Treasury and Court influence, could scarcely have been maintained in face of public disapproval. Ministerial sensitiveness to public clamour, roused and exploited by the Opposition, is one of the basic facts of pre-Reform politics. Pitt, at best, would have been forced to accept the compromise proposed by the country gentlemen of a "Union" with Fox, the word coalition being avoided. But the cry was all the other way. "So strong was the tide without doors against Mr. Fox and his majority, that they thought prudent to pass the Mutiny Bill in compliance with the wishes of the Public . . ." [1] And the King gained a popularity which some thought dangerous to the Constitution.[2]

[1] *Pol. Memoranda of Francis, 5th Duke of Leeds*, ed. O. Browning, 1884, p. 99.

[2] E.g. "The popularity acquired by the Monarch in consequence of this dismission was indeed so great as to efface all memory of former disagreements : and though originating in a cause merely accidental, and on the part of the Crown from a sudden and passionate resentment at a supposed invasion of the Prerogative, yet has it not suffered in the sequel any diminution : on the contrary, from an extraordinary concurrence of circumstances, the loyalty of the people has been elevated to a pitch of ardor which court flattery itself will scarcely hesitate to acknowledge at least commensurate with the merits of the Monarch." Belsham, *Memoirs of the Reign of George III*, 1796, iii, 352. Lord Holland calls George III in 1807 "long the most popular man in his dominions." *Memoirs of the Whig Party*, ii, 226. See Nicholls, *Recollections and Reflections*, 1820, i, 52. The absence of condemnation of the King's action, outside strict Party circles, is remarkable, e.g. Camden did not condemn (see below, pp. 142–3), Bishop Watson excused : "The King's interference . . . could not be excused on constitutional principles except by the attack which the Commons had made on the Prerogative by passing the Bill. If you will not admit the true principle of the Constitution, which is the exercise of the King's negative, you in a manner compel him to the use of his influence over Parliament, when he conceives either his prerogative to be attacked, or the safety of the country endangered or even his caprices restrained by their proceedings." *Anecdotes of the Life of Richard Watson . . .*, 1817, p. 123. The very different judgment of modern historians (even Sir John Fortescue calls the King's action "absolutely unscrupulous," *British Statesmen of the Great War*, 1911, p. 35) seems to derive from the fact that the contemporary interpretation of the patronage aspect of the India Bill (see below, pp. 141–7) has been forgotten. Cf. also p. 146, n.1.

The three elements in a stable Ministry were connexion, influence, that is patronage, and popularity. In a well-known passage Wilberforce records his belief (surely untenable) that Pitt, by reason of his popularity and the results of the 1784 election could have governed without influence.[1] Fielding in *Amelia* expressed a similar belief, in a passage which can relate only to Pitt's father. The experiment was not tried, but there is no doubt that Pitt, weak in connexion, was always concerned with the necessity of preserving popularity.[2] Fox's rapid loss of popularity,[3] while that of Pitt as rapidly progressed, increased the drama of the conflict. He was now only in derision "the man of the people," and this, together with the support given to Pitt by the radicals, reformers and "dissenting interest" left the oligarchical element in the Whig party starkly apparent, not helped by an accretion of Northites which included Sandwich and Rigby. Indeed, the significance of the loss by the Whigs of their two traditional props, trade and dissent, can hardly be overestimated.[4]

In examining the fate of Fox's Martyrs it will be necessary first to consider trends of opinion and propaganda, and then to compare the election results with Robinson's estimates. Pitt's position largely depended on the supposedly infamous

[1] *Life*, i, p. 64.

[2] Caricatures and newspaper paragraphs support Pitt's own explanation of his failure to give office to Shelburne—popular prejudice: "at present it would not be much more alarming to many to bring Lord Bute forward." Orde to Shelburne, 18 Dec., 1783. Fitzmaurice, *Shelburne*, 1876, iii, p. 412.

[3] Cf. the French Ambassador to Vergennes, 30 March, 1783: "Le Ministre populaire (Monsieur Fox) est un étrange Ministre des Affaires Etrangères; et lorsqu'il aura perdu sa popularité, ce qui s'achemine beaucoup, je ne sais ce qui lui restera." Quoted, Fitzmaurice, *Shelburne*, 1912, ii, p. 279, n.

[4] The importance of the support of the dissenters at elections was recognised by George III in 1772 (*Corr. of George III*, ed. Donne, i, p. 101), by Burke in 1789 ("A set of men powerful enough in many things, but most of all in elections." *Memorials and Corr. of Fox*, ii, p. 360), by Lord Holland in 1807: ". . . the Dissenters, upon whom in a contest with the Crown, the Whigs must always rely." *Memoirs of the Whig Party*, ii, pp. 27, 227.

character of the Coalition and on the belief that the India Bill was intended to make Fox perpetual dictator. Such opinions seem crude, the second was dismissed as absurd by Lecky, the first has recently been to some degree discredited on account of the *Robinson Papers*. How far they were justified is here scarcely relevant: the question is, were they strongly held? Undoubtedly they were, not only by the populace and as a result of widespread propaganda, but by those whose opinions command respect. Romilly denounced the "scandalous alliance," stating and dismissing the apologies for it as "an insult to the public" and adding, "Of all the public characters of this devoted country (Mr. Pitt only excepted) there is not a man who has, or who deserves, the nation's confidence." [1] So ardent a Foxite as Coke of Norfolk called the Coalition (it is said) "a most revolting compact." [2] And at the famous meeting in Westminster Hall on 14 February, when an evil-smelling bag was thrown at Fox, Dr. Jebb moved a string of resolutions beginning, "That the Coalition . . . was injurious to the cause of freedom and public virtue." [3] Later, he wrote to Wyvill, "I most cordially wish intire rout to the party of Fox, Burke and North. England, if expiring, could never be benefited by such men." [4] The chorus of dispraise could be widely extended, and Fox owned in the House that his coalition with the noble lord "had produced to him great unpopularity, great odium and great obloquy." [5]

As for the India Bill, the vital point was in its patronage provisions, not in the violation of the Company's charter. This violation was of course exploited as a threat to chartered rights, helped by Jack Lee's unlucky phrase when he called a charter "a mere skin of parchment to which is appended a seal of wax." [6] But it is what may be called

[1] *Memoirs of Romilly*, i, pp. 269–70 (21 March, 1783).
[2] M. W. Stirling, *Coke of Norfolk*, i, p. 213.
[3] Disney, *Life of Jebb*, 1787, i, pp. 191–2.
[4] *Wyvill Papers*, iv, p. 362 (23 May, 1784).
[5] *Parl. Hist.*, xxiv, p. 665 (Lord Mahon, quoting Fox).
[6] Wraxall, *Memoirs*, 1884, iii, p. 182.

the *Carlo Khan* theme which Fox admitted to have been most damaging to him,[1] and which North said had " misled the weak part of the country so strangely." [2] Fox, in squibs innumerable, and in prints, is Emperor of the East, Cromwell, Charles III, Catiline, Milton's Satan; he is " Belial . . . the fleshliest incubus " and he is Beelzebub,[3] so great was the national abhorrence of a dictator. This was owing to the belief that the India Bill would make him irremovable and would bring a vast new field of corruption into politics. Statements to this effect in parliament have been dismissed by Lecky and others as rhetorical exaggeration. But the belief was stated in the correspondence of those whose opinions cannot be disregarded. Camden, who as a lawyer may be supposed to have understood the legal position, is explicit. He wrote on the very day of the defeat of the Bill:

> A scene is opened of national disturbance such as I have never yet seen . . . Mr. Fox, feeling he had not got his master's confidence, formed a plan for his own security to get possession of the East India Patronage by vesting it in seven of his known friends, by which means the parliamentary influence of a private man would have been almost equal to the great power of the Prerogative which is the common fund of the Minister to manage Parliament. This possession would have made him too powerful to have been turned out and consequently the private being united to the Ministerial influence would have made him perpetual Dictator. The Parliament would have been bought and the King silenced.

He then describes the way in which the measure had been rushed through the Commons, Foxites urgently sum-

[1] Twiss, *Life of Eldon*, 1844, i, p. 162.

[2] *Parl. Hist.*, xxiv, p. 744. See B.M. *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires*, vi, 1938, No. 6473 (pp. 68–9).

[3] *Ibid.*, Vol. v, pp. 733–50, Vol. vi, pp. 1–130 *passim*, and *History of the Westminster Election*, 1784. It must be remembered that Cromwell had not as yet been rehabilitated. An election squib asks how Fox resembles him, and answers: " A republican who is in his heart so attached to monarchy as to despise every other form of government—a tyrant, a hypocrite, a notorious enemy to the constitution of his Country." *Ibid.*, p. 355.

moned and Opposition taken unawares, so that "the Bill came to the Lords with as much expedition as a turnpike bill." The lack of condemnation of the King's action is striking:

> By this time the Court began to understand the tendency of the Bill and as the Minister had been industrious to collect his friends there as he had been in the other House, and as the time was short, it was necessary the exertion should be uncommon, and accordingly it was reported that his Majesty should tell Lord Temple that he was an enemy to the Bill.

He adds:

> There is something whimsical enough in this Bill being so to unite Whigs and Tories in a just opposition to the principle. The Whigs were against any measure to introduce influence into parliament, either by the subject or the Sovereign, the Tories because it was given to the subject and not to the Sovereign.[1]

Bishop Watson, a Whig like Camden, was even more shocked. Portland wrote to ask him to vote for the Bill, Rutland to vote against it. "It is impossible for me," he wrote to Portland, "who have, on all occasions, opposed the corrupting influence of the Crown, to support the measure which is pregnant with more seeds of corruption than any one which has taken place since the Revolution . . ."[2] To Rutland he wrote: "I am sick of party. You are a young man and zeal may become you, but I have lost my political zeal for ever: *The Coalition has destroyed it*" (his italics). This was the attitude of the parliamentary reformers and idealists, Wyvill, Mason, Jebb and Cartwright, who all actively supported Pitt at the election. Mason wrote to Wyvill in January that the crisis was more important than Reform itself: "For what good possible do you think could occur to the nation (was our point actually carried) if Charles Fox had the Indies at his dis-

[1] H. S. Eeles, *Lord Chancellor Camden*, 1934, pp. 155–7.

[2] *Anecdotes of the Life of Richard Watson, Bishop of Llandaff*, 1817, pp. 124–5.

posal ? " [1] This was logical, since the object of the Yorkshire Reformers was " from a detestation of Corruption as a principle of Government to promote a Reformation of Parliament." [2] In a canvassing letter Wyvill urged the necessity of supporting those " who have resented measures that, in my conception, would have introduced corruption to a degree of profligacy which this country has never seen and would in fact have changed our limited Monarchy into a mere aristocratical Republic." [3]

This view of the Bill was put before the country in pamphlets and at meetings held to vote addresses to the Crown. The contention that it would make Fox dictator calls for examination, since it has been so generally dismissed as absurd, and was yet so generally believed in 1783–4. The point was that the four years of the Bill's duration would cover a general election, in which the Ministry would necessarily be returned, and would then be able to extend the period, together with the fact that the bestowal of patronage constituted a permanent claim on the allegiance of the beneficiary. This aspect of the Bill, " concerning which the public judgment was at first suspended," was made clear, to quote Belsham, an ardent Whig,

> in a number of able tracts industriously circulated, and . . . it was almost universally condemned as a measure in the highest degree arbitrary and oppressive, and with consummate artifice calculated to perpetuate the power of an administration who were the objects of the national detestation. It is nevertheless a supposition absolutely inadmissible that such men as the Duke of Portland, Lord John Cavendish and Mr. Fox had concerted a measure insidiously adapted to serve their own purpose, knowing or believing the same to be inimical to the essential interests of their country.[4]

This is self-evident, what Whig, what politician, could think his own uninterrupted office harmful to his country ?

[1] *Wyvill Papers*, iv, p. 352.
[2] *Ibid.*, iv, p. 354.
[3] *Ibid.*, iv, p. 387.
[4] Belsham, *Memoirs of the Reign of George III*, 1796, iii, pp. 347 ff.

We know indeed that Fox thought a permanent administration would be "an amazing advantage" to the country in the "opinion of Europe." [1]

The leading pamphlet on the India Bill was that of Pulteney, *The Effect to be expected from the East India Bill upon the Constitution of Great Britain . . .* (1783), though Boswell characteristically thought his own contribution better. It went rapidly through a number of editions. The question of the violation of charters, Pulteney contends, is one that undoubtedly admits of different opinions: it depends on whether the state of India demands so strong a measure. But the patronage question is of much greater importance, and on this, he thinks, opinion could not differ, if the position were understood. Patronage, heretofore divided among twenty-four Directors of differing politics and distributed without regard to party, was to be used as a state engine, either to make Fox irremovable or to increase the power of the Crown. Fox, he says "took occasion to declare that he never said that at the end of four years the nomination of the seven Directors would be given to the Crown, but that he feared it might." [2] A politic remark, Pulteney thinks, aimed at quelling fears and creating hopes on both sides of the House. He adds that it is no part of Fox's party to work for an increase in the power of the Crown, "but they like men of talent of all ages cannot be supposed averse to an independent power in themselves, which they may think it impossible they may ever abuse." This indeed was the justification of the Bill to those who, like Walpole, thought it a judicious plan for combining reform in India with Foxite predominance in Parliament ("Coupling with that rough medicine a desire of confirming the power of himself and his friends").[3] Fox wrote of the

[1] Fox's *Correspondence*, ii, p. 208 (letter of 9 Sept., 1783).

[2] This is not consistent with Fox's speech of 18 Nov. (Russell, *Life of Fox*, ii, pp. 31–2). Vacancies by death or resignation were to be filled by the King in Council. The Commissioners (at first styled Directors) could be dismissed only by an address from either or both Houses.

[3] *Letters*, ed. Toynbee, xiii, p. 138 (30 March, 1784).

Bill as "a *vigorous* and *hazardous measure* on which *all* depends." [1]

The patronage question, so closely intertwined with connexion, affects the whole of public life in the eighteenth century. The obligation of the beneficiary to give his "vote and interest" to his patron may be said to correspond to the debt of honour,[2] with obedience to political principle standing for the mere debt of commerce, then so little regarded. Examples will occur to all students of the period, but the case of Dr. Parr deserves remark. Of all Whigs he was the most uncompromising in his defence of the Coalition.[3] He wrote to Lord Dartmouth (a Northite) of the coming election for Cambridge University (for which Pitt and Lord Euston were returned after a contest):

I wish it were in my power to ask your guidance in both my votes, the one you will command, and in such a manner, I am well assured, as not to violate those feelings of anguish,

[1] Fox, *Memorials and Corr.*, ii, p. 218. Pulteney's view of the Bill is supported by Eden's correspondence: Loughborough to William Eden (n.d., *c.* Nov. 1783): "That curse of India will be the ruin first of the Administration and then of the Country . . . I have sent you the Paper which was circulated to us. You'll observe the seven Trustees are during good behaviour. That is a very favourite but a very difficult Point . . . I hold it too hazardous to try even if all the rest were safe. If it were carried it is a great Point, but for that reason I think it will fail." (It was slightly modified, see p. 145, n. 2.) Add. MSS. 34, 410, fo. 305. Eden wrote to his brother Morton, 21 Nov., 1783: "Our East India Measure is a very trying one:—undoubtedly it is a very strong proposition and will either knock us down or establish us—I am much mistaken if it will not shew that we have the Confidence and support of at least two-thirds of the House, which is a sufficient Key to my creed as to present politics." *Ibid.*, fo. 296. In view of Fox's declared intention, on taking office in 1782, of reducing the power of the Crown, the alternative to Pulteney's interpretation of the Bill would seem to be reckless opportunism. (Cf. *Hist. MSS. Corr., Carlisle MSS.*, pp. 599, 604, 623; *Parl. Hist.*, xxii, p. 1252.)

[2] Cf. the cardinal political obligation: faithfulness to connexion, illustrated (e.g.) by Yorke's distress at accepting the Chancellorship in 1770, and by Lord Holland's praise of Grenville for his faithfulness to connexion (i.e. in refusing to take office without Fox in 1804). *Memoirs of the Whig Party*, ii, p. 51.

[3] The dedication of his *Preface to Bellendenus* (1787) is to *tria lumina Anglorum*, Fox, North and Burke.

indignation, and honour, which some late scenes have roused in a mind not quite destitute of penetration of sensibility. To Lord Euston I am bound in honour to give the other vote, as his father assisted me in my master's degree . . .

He goes on to promise assistance in Warwickshire " to the friends of their country at this awful crisis." [1] Even in an awful crisis personal obligation came before political allegiance (and Euston was returned by a majority of 28 only). It is no wonder that Fox was accused of making in the India Bill " an immensity of patronage which would follow him to private life." [2] And Lord Mahon, at the Buckinghamshire meeting at which an address to the Crown was voted, answering Burke on the wrongs of India, said : " Why, says Mr. Fox, give to me, and seven men named by me, two million sterling of annual patronage, and that shall be your remedy. God defend the Nation from such a remedy as that ! " [3]

Addresses " became at length so universal," writes Belsham, " that upon no occasion whatever was the sense of the people at large more clearly, strongly, and unequivocally ascertained." [4] Bishop Watson is one of many who adds his testimony :

> The numberless addresses . . . against the Coalition Ministry sufficiently showed the voice of the people to be with Mr. Pitt. Now I consider the voice of the people to be superior, not only to the House of Commons, but to the whole legislature : I hope therefore no harm will come to the Constitution from this example. It was not so much the prerogative of the Crown that kept Mr. Pitt in his place, and set the House of Commons at defiance, as it was the sense of the nation, which on this occasion was in direct contradiction to the sense of the House of Commons.[5]

[1] *Hist. MSS. Comm., Dartmouth MSS.*, iii, 1896, p. 268 (23 Dec., 1784).
[2] *Parl. Hist.*, xxiii, 1402 (Dundas). Cf. below p. 152, n. 1.
[3] *Lond. Chron.*, 23 March, 1784 ; *Morning Herald*, same date. See also Stanhope and Gooch, *Life of Charles, third Earl Stanhope*, 1914, p. 59.
[4] *Memoirs of the Reign of George III*, iii, 1796, p. 351.
[5] Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

This is the opinion of friends and foes alike. "The passions of the vulgar made and kept Mr. Pitt Minister," writes Trotter, Fox's secretary and devotee. Fox, in 1799, wrote of the battle "lost in 1784," when we were "deserted by the people." [1] Burke's views on the mob of 1784 have already been quoted; they are consistent with his political philosophy but less so with that of Fox, and he was markedly ill at ease in the controversy which raged in Parliament before the dissolution as to whether the sense of the people was voiced by the Commons or the Addresses.

The claim for Addresses versus unrepresentative House was an old one. Chatham had made it in 1770,[2] Fox in 1780, and was to make it again in 1797, when he based a famous speech in favour of Reform on the unrepresentative character of the House returned in 1780, the very one which he upheld in 1784: "A device so shallow and barefaced," he said, "was enough to ruin the best cause . . . Indeed there was no legal way of ascertaining what the general voice was but the sense of that House." [3] Lord Mahon challenged this inconsistency, which he called habitual, and instanced a resolution of the Westminster Committee in 1780, signed by Fox as chairman, condemning a declaration by North "That the people of England could only be heard by their representatives in parliament"; this was resolved to be "unconstitutional and of dangerous import to the country." [4] The extreme lameness of Fox's rejoinder is significant, since Fox was matchless in debate. First, he often signed resolutions as chairman without agreeing with them. Secondly, he had not been opposed to this one, but though the House had not been the voice of the people in

[1] *Memorials and Corr. of Fox*, iii, p. 152.

[2] *Parl. Hist.*, xvi, pp. 663, 665, etc. (9 Jan., 1770).

[3] *Ibid.*, xxiv, pp. 462–3 (2 Feb.).

[4] *Ibid.*, xxiv, pp. 575–6 (9 Feb.). The parliamentary sequel is interesting: Fox said, answering North: "When majorities acted wrong, he would both within that House, and out of it, declare his disapprobation of their conduct . . . but the noble lord pronounced it as the indispensable duty of a minister to hold the decision of that House in the strictest reverence." *Ibid.*, xviii, p. 1094.

1780, it had since become so by the Contractors' Bill and " other salutary laws." That is, by the reforms of 1782, which could hardly have affected a House returned in 1780. A few days later Fox had shifted his ground, and in the course of a long debate on addresses said : " that he disregarded the opinion of the people no man would imagine, it had been the business of his life to court popularity ; but there were circumstances in which the people might err, and under such circumstances it became an act of duty to resist them." [1] This is the orthodox Whig view of the *débâcle*. Among the many satirical prints on the crisis (some 300 in the British Museum) it is in Foxite prints that Pitt is supported by " popular frenzy " or " the breath of popularity." In one the King, Pitt and Thurlow are held up by bubble-balloons inscribed " the wishes of the people." [2] Sheridan spoke contemptuously of " the arts practised to corrupt the majority " [3] and Fox asserted that he had never appeared as " the mean candidate of popular approbation." [4] Fox's attitude was wittily satirised in a Westminster election squib : " Mr. Fox has upheld the House of Commons against the Freeholders, Electors, and People of Great Britain in the case of the Middlesex Election and in all the late important questions in Parliament." [5]

By resisting a dissolution, besides strengthening all the imputations against themselves, the Foxites were landed in the awkward position of upholding a parliament which, elected in 1780 to strengthen North's hand, had supported four ministries in turn. Lord Russell, commenting on this, regrets that Fox did not choose rather to attack secret influence and prerogative. The answer of course is that the attempt was made but broke on Temple's resignation (there seems no reason to dismiss Tomline's statement that it was

[1] *Ibid.*, xxiv, p. 647.
[2] B.M. *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires*, vi, 1938, Nos. 6438, 6775, 6486, etc.
[3] *Parl. Hist.*, xxiv, p. 296 (12 Jan.).
[4] *Ibid.*, xxiv, p. 449 (29 Jan.).
[5] *Hist. of the Westminster Election . . .*, 1784, p. 95.

made to appease the public mind),[1] on confidence in Pitt's integrity, on the growing popularity of the King's action and the common belief that King, Lords and people were united in defence of the Constitution. Such is the tenor of the addresses. Nevertheless the situation was critical.[2] "Mr. Pitt could not then [in December] form any opinion of the extent to which that popular cry, of secret influence, might be carried." Pitt boldly justified the use of the prerogative: "Prerogative, sir, has been justly called the friend of the people. . . ." [3] Again, at the great Yorkshire meeting of 25 March, Spencer Stanhope declared that Temple had acted openly, and retaliated: "Secret influence has been the cry since Lord Bute's time . . . yet all his sons vote with the Coalition, Lord North too was called the creature of secret influence." He maintained that the danger was no longer from the prerogative as in the time of the Star Chamber, or even of North. There was not the immense patronage of the war, Lord North's war, and the civil list had been reduced: "At present I fear more the tyranny of Venice than that of France." [4] Indeed, secret influence in the popular imagination was so firmly associated with Bute and North that it was doubly difficult to fix it upon Pitt. Nevertheless, great efforts were made to raise the cry: the "key of the Backstairs" draped in black as "Secret Influence Key in Mourning" was an emblem used in Westminster.[5] And the Duchess of Devonshire wrote to her mother, "There was a new play last night in which the Back Stairs was introduced, it produced an angry riot

[1] The theory that it was because he wanted a dukedom (party gibes apart) seems to derive from a disgruntled letter dated 29 December, clearly relating to Ireland after the Regency crisis and consistent with letters of that date (1789) in the *Dropmore Papers*. It is printed in Buckingham's *Courts and Cabinets of George*, i, 291–3, and there attributed to 1783, an impossible date: Temple had then no connexion with Ireland.

[2] For Pitt's uneasiness, see especially two letters of 23 Dec. to Temple, in Stanhope, *Miscellanies*, 2nd Series, 1872, pp. 36–7.

[3] Tomline, *Life of Pitt*, p. 249; *Parl. Hist.*, xxiv, p. 486.

[4] *Wyvill Papers*, ii, pp. 340–1.

[5] *Full and authentic Account of the Proceedings in Westminster Hall*, 1784, pp. 26–7. B.M. *Catalogue of Pol. and Personal Satires*, v, p. 119.

and they would not allow them to proceed for a long time, however *we* got the better at last." [1]

The addresses, thanking the King for the salutary use of his prerogative, were agreed to have been decisive. They began, according to seventeenth-century precedent, with one from the City of London presented on 16 January. Its general tenor was that of the other addresses. Explicit and implicit is the declaration that Crown and people were united to overthrow a "corrupt oligarchy" or "a desperate faction." The Coalition were charged with denying the constitutional rights of the Crown and the Lords. Confidence was expressed in the new "able and upright" Ministers. As time went on other points were added: abhorrence of the attempt to cut off supplies and to oppose the prerogative of dissolution. Addresses filled the *Gazette*, they flowed in till the beginning of May, though the high tide was in March. They came from places which were unrepresented as well as from counties and boroughs and from "inhabitants" as well as electors: the question of Reform underlay the issue between the House of Commons and the Addressers. In Scotland the addresses reflect the movement for borough reform, Glasgow being especially emphatic. In England there were addresses from Birmingham, Leeds, Wolverhampton, Rotherham, Halifax, Doncaster, Wakefield, Sunderland, as well as from smaller places. There were also addresses from Belfast and from the Presbyterian ministers of the Synod of Ulster, who declared that "in all Revolutions they had been most loyal to the Crown." Some places, using the old formula, offered their "lives and fortunes" to the King, and the sense of "an awful crisis"—to use Parr's phrase—runs through many of the addresses. Appeals for parliamentary reform were made by Yorkshire, Carnarvon, Rotherham and Scarborough. Halifax stressed the right of dissolution as "the most sacred and salutary branch of the royal prerogative" . . . "without it the apprehension of a septennial servitude, in a moment like

[1] *Anglo-Saxon Review*, Sept. 1899, p. 73.

this, would produce alarms, just indeed, but dreadful . . ." Norwich was the second place to address and two strongly worded documents came from Bristol. Other noteworthy towns were Westminster, Southwark, Canterbury, Worcester, Warwick, Coventry, Leicester, Northampton, Bedford, St. Albans, Newcastle, Liverpool, Chester, Hull, York, Beverley, Durham, Colchester, Salisbury, Plymouth, Exeter, Taunton. The merchants and traders of London also presented an address.

The counties which addressed were Middlesex, Berkshire, Cornwall, Northumberland, Leicester, Warwick, Devon, Suffolk, Oxford, Buckinghamshire, Yorkshire, Anglesea, Denbigh, Carnarvon and Glamorgan, with many Scottish counties, and the grand juries of Buckinghamshire, Essex, Surrey and Somerset. There were only (in the *Gazette*) two addresses favourable to the Coalition, Middlesex and Lancaster, and both places presented counter-addresses. An attempt by Lord Sandwich to promote a Foxite address in Huntingdon failed.[1]

There were some 230 addresses in the *Gazette* and some appear to have been crowded out. That from Yorkshire was by far the most important and was regarded as critical. Its close connexion with the Yorkshire election is well known.[2]

[1] " Lord S. made some efforts for an Address to the King to dismiss his present Ministry and take in the late, but was told by some of his friends that to be sure many of them would and must sign such a one, but on casting up the numbers privately there was two to one against such a thing, and that the County would be more strong against it, he judged well in Droping it." Ewin to Lord Hardwicke, 19 March. Add. MSS. 35629, fo. 20–20b. (I am indebted to Miss H. M. Cam for this and other references to the Hardwicke Papers.) Yet Sandwich was all powerful in the town : " The interest of the Earl of Sandwich is so powerful, as always to return two members ; and this he effects, not by weight of property for his lordship has but one house in the whole town, but by his popularity, and the obligations which he was enabled to confer upon some of his principal friends during his connexion with Lord North's Administration." Oldfield, *Hist. of Boroughs*, 1794, i, pp. 319–20. In the county " the Duke of Manchester and Lord Sandwich always return the two members." *Ibid.*, i, p. 316.

[2] *Life of Wilberforce*, i, pp. 50–64, 326 ; A. M. W. Stirling, *Annals of a Yorkshire House*, ii, pp. 191 ff.

In the ferment caused by meetings and addresses the elections began. Election issues were then so local that each place provided its squibs and lampoons, but in 1784 there was a " celebrated index " to *The Beauties of Fox, North and Burke* which was said to be used at elections with great effect. There were at least two versions of this index, both in the form of a newspaper. One, besides the deadly references to past speeches, contained lists of the House of Commons divided into those who supported " Mr. Pitt and the Constitution," those who voted against him, and absentees. There were also twelve telling " points " and a treatise by Dean Tucker on " The Cardinal Point " : the right of the King to appoint Ministers. This Index was sold at the significant price of 6*d*. a copy, a guinea a hundred and eight guineas a thousand.[1] There can be no doubt that the constitutional issues were skilfully, and of course tendenciously, stated and widely circulated. They were cleverly embodied in pictorial satire. Foxite propaganda was also displayed in prints and in Westminster election squibs. Its topics were secret influence, the destruction of the Commons and Pitt's youth. Temple, holding the dark lantern of a conspirator, leads Pitt up the Back Stairs ; Pitt and Dundas put up to auction the Rights of the People in 558 volumes.[2]

How is the contemporary belief in a landslide consistent with the character of an eighteenth-century election ? For Robinson's papers were not needed to show how completely patronage and custom dominated not only close boroughs but those which were nominally open, and also counties. The inestimable works of Oldfield together with the *Wyvill Papers* conveniently show how all-pervading was patronage. The returns in Stooks Smith, though an unsatisfactory record of " contests," show how from generation to generation the same families represented boroughs and counties,

[1] Copy in B.M. 1890.e.22, fo. 33 (Banks Collection). See B.M. *Catalogue, ut supra*, vi, pp. 22–3 ; *Morning Post*, 6 April, 1784.

[2] B.M. *Catalogue*, vi, Nos. 6417, 6469.

how a natural progress for the son of a local peer was from a borough to the county and from the county to the Lords. From Oldfield, as well as from memoirs and correspondence, we learn that a contest was not necessarily, or even normally, connected with politics, but was a struggle between rival families for county or borough patronage, which, if interests were evenly matched, generally led to a compromise by which each agreed to nominate one member. Such arrangements were common to avoid the expense and disturbance of a contest. After 1784 they were stigmatised as coalitions. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that politics occasionally invaded elections because families were by tradition Whig or Tory. That politics should override personal relations was deplored.[1] Even in 1784 Pittite interests supported Foxites and *vice versa* ; for instance, Harbord, the Pittite member for Norwich, supported Coke in the County.[2] In counties which by exception were free from aristocratic dominance and therefore considered independent, property and tradition had decreed that certain families had prescriptive rights. A Coke in Norfolk, a Bunbury in Suffolk or a Penruddock in Wiltshire was a predestined knight of the shire. In normal times such members were unshakable. Added to this was the strong feeling against opposing the sitting member : to do so was to commit that crime of crimes, " disturbing the peace of the county." " You cannot conceive the effect of the magic sounds, disturbing the peace of the county," ' wrote Gibbon to Holroyd in 1774, advising him not to stand for Sussex.[3] Mrs. Coke wrote a

[1] Cf. a letter of Windham, 3 May, 1796. *Windham Papers*, ii, p. 11. A comment on a by-election for Norwich is significant : " The contest, which at first promised to be merely a trial of strength between the friends of two most respectable country gentlemen, has now assumed a more important aspect, and seems to involve the great question . . . of the policy or impolicy of the war . . ." *Morning Herald*, 27 May, 1799. Sheridan, M.P. for Stafford, canvassed in 1799 for Lord Granville Leveson-Gower, who was standing for the county. *Private Corr. of Lord G. Leveson-Gower*, 1917, i, pp. 242–4.

[2] A. M. W. Stirling, *Coke of Norfolk* . . . i, pp. 220–1.

[3] Gibbon, *Private Letters*, ed. Prothero, 1896, i, pp. 225 ff.

canvassing letter for her husband in 1784: "an intention is publicly avowed by Sir J. Wodehouse's friends to disturb the peace of the county by putting him in opposition to the old members." [1] The phrase is recurrent in election correspondence. The established interest, however feeble, wrote Gibbon, "always fights with very great advantages." When a death or resignation occurred, then could a candidate, suitably qualified by landed property and adequately supported by the correct local interests, put himself forward.[2] Such a candidate was not necessarily pledged to either party. For instance, Charles Grey, returned in his absence for Northumberland in 1786, on the Percy interest, was free to choose between Pitt and Fox.[3] Hence the fact that elections were often arranged by correspondence whose tenor suggests a candidate for an academic post, intimately known to a small selection committee already decided in his favour, and this even in constituencies which prided themselves on being free from aristocratic patronage.[4] On the other hand, the contest was welcomed in the frankly corrupt constituency, for example, to cite Oldfield, Colchester "celebrated in the annals of controversy and corruption."

In what ways could popular feeling make itself felt at an election? First, in the very few constituencies where "the sense of the people" was held to reside. "Fox would often say," writes Wilberforce, agreeing, "that Yorkshire and Middlesex between them make up all England." [5] They doubtless included London and Westminster, York and possibly Hull. In much the same category was Surrey, though by no means free from aristocratic influence, with

[1] A. M. W. Stirling, *Coke of Norfolk*, i, p. 220.

[2] Gibbon, *op. et loc. cit.*

[3] *Journal of Lady Holland*, ed. Lord Ilchester, 1908, i, p. 100. Grey was returned in place of Lord Algernon Percy, who succeeded to a peerage.

[4] See for instance the letters of Cornwallis on the candidature of his son for Suffolk in 1796. *Cornwallis Corr.*, 1859, ii, pp. 303 ff. A letter from George Osborne to Hawkesbury (Liverpool) about his son's candidature for Bedfordshire in 1794 is astonishingly regardless of political connexions. Add. MSS. 38,548, fo. 176.

[5] *Life of Wilberforce*, ii, p. 133 (1795). See below, p. 168, n. 4.

Southwark, which, says Oldfield, "was under no influence of any degree or kind, owing to its great population and opulence." Hertfordshire "had the singular advantage of maintaining its independence." Norfolk and Suffolk were regarded as pre-eminently independent counties. Besides these were Kent and Shropshire, and (recently) Northamptonshire, where a violent contest had exhausted conflicting interests. Some others had a chance of independence, or were independent as to one member. Somerset and Wiltshire had (by 1792) undertaken not to return the son of a peer. The majority were under aristocratic influence, and in these the prestige attaching to county membership was unconnected with "the sense of the people." Some large towns were independent, notably Norwich, Bristol (though this was compromised after 1784), Exeter, Coventry, Liverpool, Canterbury, York, Leicester and, after 1789, Gloucester. Others, though independent, were venal, for instance, Stafford, Hull, Worcester and Colchester.[1]

An election fought on political issues was something to be remembered in the history of a county: such notable elections (before 1784) were pre-eminently Middlesex in 1768 and 1769, Norfolk in 1734,[2] Surrey in 1780, when Keppel was invited to stand as a rebuff to George III, who had canvassed against him in Windsor, his old seat.[3] The importance of a mandate from the very few populous and open constituencies was such that at by-elections during the American War and at the general election of 1780, although the Ministry had a large majority, money was squandered by North in an attempt to secure favourable results in the City, Westminster, Bristol, Coventry, Surrey,

[1] This summary is based on Oldfield, *Hist. of Boroughs*, 1792 (2nd ed. 1794) and *Representative History . . .*, 1816, supplemented by the *Wyvill Papers*. For the Colchester election in 1784 cf. Hist. MSS. Comm., *Rutland Papers*, iii, p. 122.

[2] Appealed to as a precedent at the Norfolk election in 1806. *Poll for . . . Norfolk . . .*, 1806.

[3] B.M. *Catalogue of Pol. and Personal Satires*, v, 1935, Nos. 5700, 5701, 5708.

and Gloucestershire. He explained to the King that he was "very unwillingly drawn into the contests . . ., but the necessity of strengthening the Government at that time, and weakening the Opposition, and the fair prospect of success prevailed upon him to advise the beginning." Consequently over £8,000 was fruitlessly spent in Westminster, £4,000 in Surrey, £4,000 in the City.[1] Compared with the price of boroughs these sums are startling.

Such places then had a vast importance. In what other ways could opinion manifest itself? By overthrowing interest in counties and in boroughs; this, even in small constituencies, showed the unusual contagion of political excitement; by defeating the vested interests of established families and old members (this is the basis of the pamphlet called *Fox's Martyrs*); by the proscription of those who had taken a prominent part on the unpopular side. All these things were done in 1784 and to a degree that seemed phenomenal.

Robinson's *Papers* strikingly illustrate the landslide character of the election. He seems to have been over-optimistic in his estimate of the members who, though supporters of the Coalition, would side with Pitt. Those who were suspected of responding to his overtures were called Robinson's Rats; a list of twenty-two appeared in the *Morning Post* (10 Feb.) which it is interesting to compare with his own calculations.[2] Fox's dwindling majority was thus (by the Foxites) attributed to the manœuvres of Robinson, but the rot had then hardly begun. Robinson was called *Renegado*, because, though North's man, he had put his valuable information at the service of the enemy.[3] His defence to North was that this information was due to his official position as Treasury Secretary and that a similar state of the House of Commons had already been given to

[1] *Corr. of George III*, ed. Fortescue, v, pp. 465 ff.; Donne, *Corr. of George III with Lord North*, ii, pp. 425.

[2] B.M. *Catalogue, ut supra*, vi, No. 6431, etc.; Robinson, *Parliamentary Papers*, pp. 54–5.

[3] B.M. *Catalogue, ut supra*, vi, No. 6927 (27 Feb.).

Shelburne.[1] But he expected few changes in the personnel of the House, except in boroughs which were purchasable or bribable, lists of which he gives, or in the hands of friends, like the Eliot boroughs in Cornwall.

In six counties only did he see any chance of change: in two, Somerset and Monmouth, because of an expected death. In Yorkshire because of the resignation of Savile; he did not expect a second Pittite member. Savile's nephew Foljambe succeeded him unopposed in December, but gave great offence to the Yorkshire Association by his support of the Coalition.[2] In Sussex because there was an old desire for a contest on the part of Lord Surrey, that election buccaneer. Sussex was divided between the Lennox and the Pelham interests; it was no time to challenge the Duke of Richmond and no contest took place. In Cumberland Robinson thought a contest for Sir Henry Fletcher's seat possible. The county, according to Oldfield, was compromised between the Portland and Lowther interests in such a way that a contest was impossible, and none occurred. Robinson expressed doubts as to Buckinghamshire and thought that in Middlesex the members would be "*perhaps the same.*"[3]

Actually, besides the sensational victory of Wilberforce in Yorkshire, there was a number of quite unexpected and noteworthy county martyrs, whose defeat was the main sensation of the election. In Berkshire there were two, but only one, Hartley, ventured to poll. He then, if *Fox's Martyrs* is to be believed, contested Gloucestershire, getting only twenty votes, but there is no record of a poll and this

[1] Hist. MSS. Comm., 10*th Report*, App. vi. (*Abergavenny Papers*), p. 64. The Treasury State of the House given to Shelburne is in the *Robinson Papers*, pp. 43–8.

[2] *Wyvill Papers*, iv., p. 382. Wyvill thought he had supported measures "highly dangerous to the Peace and Liberty of the Country."

[3] *Robinson Papers*, pp. 66–70. The names of the county members, characterised as Abroad, Ill can't attend, Pro, Hopeful, Doubtful, and Con, are given on pp. 51–2, but with the misleading page caption "the Parliamentary Election of 1780." He expected Duncombe's Yorkshire colleague to be "Doubtful."

must be taken as doubtful. There were two in Buckinghamshire where the Grenville interest was strong. Tom Grenville (who did not poll) was displaced by his brother William, whose canvassing is described by Cowper ; Lord Verney was defeated by Aubrey after a close contest,[1] and the victory was achieved despite the influence of the Duke of Portland.[2] Both Essex and Gloucestershire were, according to Oldfield, so compromised between two interests that no contest was possible. Nevertheless, in both counties, the Foxite lost his seat. Robinson managed to be put at the head of a hundred Essex freeholders as an election day demonstration.[3] No polling is recorded for either county.

The defeat of Sturt for Dorset was quite unexpected—the county was one with a chance of independence. In Staffordshire, though the influence of the Pittite Lord Gower was strong, Lord Lewisham's defeat was unexpected. In Middlesex Wilkes remained a strong Pittite, contrary to Robinson's forecast, and lost prestige by doing so, since, as Robinson said, his credit depended on his being in Opposition.[4] His colleague Byng, an uncompromising Foxite, was challenged by Mainwaring, chairman of the Middlesex bench, and a strange knight of the shire. Mainwaring headed the poll, Byng was beaten by Wilkes, but by a small majority. In Hertfordshire Halsey polled and was defeated.

The Surrey election was long remembered. Sir Joseph Mawbey, the Southwark distiller and a butt of the wits, was a Pittite, Sir Robert Clayton a Foxite. He was so confident of keeping his seat that he returned two Foxites for his borough of Bletchingley. But, as Oldfield says, he " gave so much umbrage to the people and became so unpopular from the support which he gave to the Coalition " that he

[1] Rose, *Pitt and Napoleon*, p. 207. (Letter of George III to Pitt, 12 April ; he expected Aubrey to relinquish to Lord Verney.)

[2] Cf. Hist. MSS. Comm., *Dropmore Papers*, i, pp. 363, 590.

[3] See below, p. 166, n. 3.

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 68. Wilkes was popularly accused of a coalition with the King, see B.M. *Catalogue, ut supra*, vi, No. 6568.

did not venture to poll. In 1787 Nicholls resigned his Bletchingley seat to his patron.

Norfolk and Suffolk were alike in being divided between the two parties, in each case the Foxite was the member whose stake in the county was regarded as making him safe in all circumstances. Robinson had written of Coke, " his connections, &c. carry him dead." [1] Nevertheless, he withdrew before election day, but not before having spent large sums on electioneering. He was the Fox's Martyr par excellence—the pamphlet prints his name and attributes within a black border. " I was rejected," he wrote long afterwards, " and I glory in being one of those who were called Fox's Martyrs." [2] The King wrote " nothing can be more material than the account of Mr. Coke having declined in Norfolk, as it is as strong a proof as the decision in Yorkshire of the genuine sense of the people." [3] Coke attributed his defeat chiefly to the dissenters. The Suffolk election was scarcely less sensational. The people, says Oldfield, " in consequence of the connexion of Sir Thomas Bunbury with the Coalition " proposed Mr. Grigby, because he was " attached to the cause of liberty." [4] In Bedfordshire the Duke of Bedford and Lord St. John each returned one member, but in 1784 the St. John influence was challenged, Lord Ongley was one vote behind St. John, was seated on petition but rejected on a second petition.

Such victories, by the defeat of " the established interest " in Yorkshire, Dorset, Surrey, Norfolk, Suffolk, Hertfordshire and Middlesex, counties which stood out as independent and populous, were great events, though only the last three come within Professor Laprade's category of contest. The position in Cambridgeshire is not without interest ; though both members were classed by Robinson as Pittite, Hardwicke, the patron of one seat, was Foxite.

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 69.

[2] A. M. W. Stirling, *Coke of Norfolk*, i, pp. 221–9.

[3] Rose, *Pitt and Napoleon*, p. 207.

[4] Joshua Grigby was the " Association " (Reform) member for Suffolk. *Wyvill Papers*, iv, p. 407.

"Robinson and his electioneers" are said to have been present in the shire hall, "prepared to offer a test," but desisted on assurance that both candidates were "in favour of Mr. Pitt and a Reform."[1] Pitt's position as Minister and dispenser of patronage made him very acceptable to Cambridge University. There was cross-voting, showing that political issues were little regarded. Hardwicke, the High Steward, gave his interest to Pitt and Mansfield (Solicitor-General to the Coalition). Townshend, as a member of Trinity College, was said to be sure of Trinity support and his defeat by Lord Euston caused surprise.[2] The University thus produced two martyrs.

Two unexpected defeats in counties may have been Foxite successes. In Derbyshire the Curzon interest was defeated and Mundy got in[3]; the Duke of Devonshire always returned the senior member for the county. In Lancashire, Egerton, of whom Robinson had had hopes, was replaced by John Blackburne.[4] No polling is recorded for either county.

It is impossible to go in detail through all the large towns which produced martyrs. Northampton and York were perhaps the most outstanding. Robinson thought that in Northampton the Compton and Spencer interests would combine, each returning one member. According to *Fox's Martyrs*, £100,000 had recently been spent in establishing the Spencer interest, the member being Lord Lucan, Lord Spencer's brother-in-law. The Duchess of Devonshire wrote to her mother, "at all events St. Albans is a great

[1] B.M. Add. MSS. 35,629, fo. 32 (letter of W. H. Ewin, 8 April).

[2] *Ibid.*, fo. 26 (letter of 2 April). Ewin writes, "I go with the stream, Pitt and Townshend of my own College." See also Add. MSS. 35,629, fo. 211, and cf. above, p. 146 (Dr. Parr's letter). Pitt had contemplated contesting Cambridge University at the by-election caused by Mansfield's appointment as Solicitor-General (letter of 16 Nov., 1783). Hist. MSS. Comm., *Lonsdale Papers*, 1893, p. 140.

[3] Cf. *Malmesbury Diaries and Corr.*, ii, p. 65.

[4] If Blackburne (of Hales, Lancashire) was the nephew of Bamber Gascoyne of whom Robinson wrote on 7 April, the victory was Pittite. *Robinson Papers*, p. 123.

comfort, other elections go on ill, but let Northampton, Westminster and York succeed, and we shall not be disgraced." [1] Lucan's defeat by Fiennes Trotman was among the sensations of the election. In York Lord John Cavendish's defeat was unexpected and had a great effect. Robinson had expected both members, one a Pittite, to be returned. Coventry also stands out. Though " very open," Robinson had expected the return of the two coalition members " for quietness." Later he writes, the people " have applied that nobody may be set up for they mean to set up a son of S. Smith of Aldermanbury and another by a union to turn out the present members." [2] Samuel Smith, a cousin of Wilberforce, actually won a seat at Worcester, but Lord Sheffield and Henry Conway were both defeated after a close contest. Gibbon wrote to Sheffield from Lausanne that he had been " at first most delighted with your hint that you were setting off for Coventry without any prospect of an opposition . . . I am not much surprised that you should have been swept away in the general unpopularity, since even in this quiet place your friends are considered as a factious crew, acting in direct opposition to both King and People." [3]

Worcester was notoriously venal and the Treasury had, it is said, promised £20,000 (?£2,000) towards the expenses of a contest.[4] Smith, however, got in without a contest, thus leading support to Wraxall's remark that " corruption for once became almost unnecessary." [5] In Southwark Robinson expected both members to support Pitt and to be re-elected. But Sir Richard Hotham remained a Foxite and was a noted martyr. He had headed the poll in 1780, in 1784 he did not venture to poll, but was turned out by Sir Barnard Turner, a Pittite alderman. Turner died shortly

[1] *Anglo-Saxon Review*, 1899, ii, p. 76.
[2] *Robinson Papers*, pp. 78, 117; Rose, *Pitt and Napoleon*, p. 206.
[3] Gibbon, *Private Letters*, 1899, ii, pp. 100 f.
[4] Laprade, " Public Opinion in the General Election of 1784," *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, 1913, pp. 224–37.
[5] *Memoirs*, 1884, iii, p. 338.

afterwards and in June Hotham stood and was defeated by le Mesurier, another Pittite alderman and an East India Director. In Hull, despite some annoyance at Wilberforce's resignation to sit for the county, Spencer Stanhope was returned unopposed, so that in all three Pittites were returned. Robinson had thought Burke's friends might contest Bristol; there was a contest and the Northite, Daubeny, was a martyr. Burke again sat for Malton, Lord Fitzwilliam's borough.

Among places where interest was defeated was Bury St. Edmunds, Grafton's borough: the corporation refused to accept General Conway, who, contrary to expectation, had remained a strong Foxite. Grafton was forced to nominate a Pittite.[1] In Beverley the Pelham interest was defeated in the person of Evelyn Anderson, a prominent Foxite; Robinson had expected the old members to be returned. In Sudbury, a borough which Robinson called "as open as the day and night too," but which he expected to be hostile, there were two martyrs, involving the defeat of the Crespigny interest. In Bridgnorth (contrary to Robinson's forecast) the electors, to quote Oldfield, gave proof of their independence "by displacing their old favourite member Admiral Pigot, for voting for the Coalition." At Wootton Bassett, according to Robinson, one seat could be had for £3,000. The Treasury agreed to spend an equal amount to that spent by the Pittite candidate. Actually they spent £2,500 before the seat was abandoned as hopeless.[2] No polling took place, but North's son, a martyr at Harwich, was returned, together with one of the Conways, This seems to show to what an extent Foxites were thrown back on venal boroughs. Penryn was in the same category, providing two seats out of five which Robinson estimated could all be had for a total of £12,000. Penryn, how-

[1] *Fox's Martyrs*; Rose, *Pitt and Napoleon*, p. 206. Grafton was presumably pledged to Conway, the old member.

[2] Chatham MSS. 137, 183, cited Laprade, "Public Opinion in the General Election of 1784," *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, 1913, pp. 224–37.

ever, was *a contra*, for which Rose was "heartily sorry",[1] probably because money had been fruitlessly spent.

The proscription of prominent Foxites, after the county elections, is best illustrated by the fate of the India Bill Commissioners, the Seven Kings as they were called. Sir Gilbert Elliot declined the poll for Roxburgh, his old seat (doubtless the election was managed by Dundas). He tried for Leominster, where Scott, afterwards Lord Eldon, was asked by his barber if it were true that he was one of the Seven Kings: "because if I might tell the people that you assured me that he was, he has not a chance." The assurance was given, and Elliot was defeated[2]; he tried for Bridgwater and was defeated there. Lord Lewisham was rejected for Staffordshire; Robert Gregory was an unexpected martyr for Rochester. North's son, a martyr for Harwich, got in, as we have seen, for the venal Wootton Bassett. Fitzwilliam was safe in the Lords, Montagu and Fletcher equally so in the Commons, the former as Fitzwilliam's nominee for Higham Ferrers, the latter as Portland's for Cumberland.

The Foxites made no attempt to minimise the disaster, as the account in the *Annual Register* shows. Nevertheless, the character of the defeat is illuminated by an examination of the three chief Foxite "victories" (in places where "the sense of the people" could be expressed) summed up in a Westminster Election verse:

> Our Westminster, Norwich, and London successes,
> Are a glorious comment on your boasted addresses.[3]

In Westminster, Lord Hood, the new candidate, was not challenged for the first place. The whole Foxite strength was directed against Wray, very vulnerable from a reputation for parsimony, and because, having originally been brought in by Fox, he could be traduced as Judas. The attempt to make an issue of Reform, for which Wray

[1] *Robinson Papers*, pp. 107, 124.
[2] Twiss, *Life of Eldon*, i, p. 163.
[3] *Hist. of the Westminster Election . . .*, 1784, p. 501.

especially stood, failed completely. For his support of Wray Cartwright was pilloried as "The Drum Major of Sedition." [1] No one questioned that the Duchess of Devonshire turned the scale, and gave Fox his narrow margin. Walpole goes so far as to say "she certainly procured the greater part of Mr. Fox's votes for him." [2] For many days he had despaired. The gross abuse heaped upon her in an attempt to deter her from canvassing is a measure of her achievement. She wrote to her mother: "I would give the world to be with you for I am unhappy beyond measure here and abus'd for nothing. Yet as it is begun I must go on with it . . . they insist upon our all continuing to canvass—in short they say having begun and not going on would cause a deal of harm." [3]

In Norwich there was a vacancy. Sir Harbord Harbord, the old member, was a Pittite and got over a thousand votes more than Windham, who defeated Hobart by 63. In London the tradition that members should be re-elected was particularly strong, as was the custom that they should be aldermen. The old members were in fact returned: the two Pittites at the head of the poll, Brook Watson with 4789 votes, Watkin Lewes with 4554. Such totals had never before been reached and were not reached again till 1812. And Watson, who had been returned at a by-election in January, did not become an alderman till June. Next came the two Foxites, Newnham and Sawbridge. Robinson had expected this result, "unless an attack can be made on Sawbridge from present circumstances." [4] The attack was made in the unpopular person of Richard Atkinson (the "minor Kinson" of the *Rolliad*), not then an alder-

[1] Print by Rowlandson. B.M. *Catalogue* (*ut supra*), vi, No. 6474. Wyvill found it impossible in the winter of 1784–5 to get popular support by meetings and petitions for Pitt's Reform Bill. *Wyvill Papers*, iv, pp. 394–409. He attributed the defeat of the Bill to the influence of the aristocracy "for want of the general support of the people." *A Defence of Dr. Price . . .*, 1792, p. x. Cf. below, p. 168, n. 4.

[2] *Letters*, xiii, p. 41 n.

[3] *Anglo-Saxon Review*, 1899, Sept., pp. 74 ff. B.M. *Catalogue* (*ut supra*), vi, No. 6493, etc.

[4] *Robinson Papers*, p. 74.

man; he was seven votes behind Sawbridge (who was supported by the Pittite Wilkes). The two Foxites were 3000 votes behind the two Pittites and if the votes given to Atkinson be added the Pittite majority would be nearly 6,000. And 56 votes had been squandered on Pitt, who had not consented to stand, and 287 on the ubiquitous Samuel Smith, who withdrew on the second day.[1] Yet in the circumstances of the election this counted as a Foxite victory. "The result in the City," wrote Lansdowne "is entirely ascribed to mismanagement." [2]

According to Wraxall, "never since the accession of the House of Hanover did the Crown or the Treasury make less pecuniary efforts for obtaining favourable returns . . ." [3] The account in the *Annual Register*, probably by Burke,[4] is equally emphatic: ". . . Friendship—gratitude and even dependency gave way . . . Power, activity and popularity were exerted on a field, neglected and almost deserted by the adversary. . . . So complete a rout of what was

[1] Beavan, *Aldermen of London*, i, p. 281.

[2] Hist. MSS. Comm., *Rutland Papers*, iii, pp. 84–5.

[3] *Memoirs*, 1884, iii, p. 337. Cf. Robinson's account of his own electioneering in East Anglia. He wrote to Jenkinson from Harwich on 4 April: "! . . I have been hard at work since the Proprietors' list has been fixed upon, for they delayed it so as to straiten me much in time: in the whole I have wrote or arranged about 220 Persons, having in number 260 Votes. I apprehend from the Treasury they will not stir much, but it was understood at our Meeting that I as an Individual should, and I have accordingly done so—I have been fortunately of more service to them here in the Neighbouring Contests than I could have conceived—Ipswich I clearly managed and carried for them by the weight of 42 Voters from hence—properly kept back, arranged, and at the last Moment declaring—Suffolk we assisted in, as also Sudbury—Colchester very substantially. And the People hereabouts flattered me by proposing to put me at the head of upwards of 100 Freeholders for the county of Essex as *I wished*. . . . The People here indeed behave with noble Attachment and Duty to our Sovereign and may be lead to any thing expressive of it—I like them more than before, they are so steady and firm to their principles." Add. MSS. 38,567, folios 187–8.

[4] Though he is sometimes said to have ceased writing for the *Annual Register* in 1780, there can be little doubt that he wrote or superintended the account of his quarrel with Fox in 1791, pp. 119 ff. Glenbervie was informed that it was "perfectly well known in the trade that he wrote the historical part to the end of the year 1792." *Diaries*, ed. F. Bickley, 1928, i, p. 252. Windham had denied Burke's authorship. *Ibid.*, i, p. 97.

looked upon as one of the strongest and most powerful parties that ever existed in Great Britain, is scarcely to be credited." That the results were a surprise to Robinson will be clear to anyone who compares his estimates with the results. "It exceeds all expectation," he wrote to Jenkinson early in the election, "the way in which all the contests turn out." [1] Two days later, on 6 April, the King wrote to Pitt, regretting Norwich, "undoubtedly as yet the elections have proved beyond the hopes of the most sanguine friends." [2] There could be no better judges than Robinson and George III. And on April 7 the Foxite candidates for Yorkshire withdrew. Duncombe wrote to Wilberforce in 1789: "Many members have confessed to me that they owe their success in their own counties to the example set by ours." [3] It was the county elections which evoked most comment. In fact, every one knew and discounted the value of returns for close or venal constituencies. The 1784 election was remarkable, not for an exceptionally extensive change in the composition of the House, but for the ferment in which it took place, for the character of the Pittite victories, and for the way in which Foxites were thrown back on nomination seats or venal boroughs. Within the limits of the system, a mandate could scarcely have been more emphatic. One of many tributes to the victory is that of the member for Bramber who feared that Pitt might be tempted by its magnitude to the dangerous course of conducting his Ministry "on such a narrow system as public virtue." [4] We know that Wilberforce thought that he could have done so.

In attempts to explain the disaster the gold of the East

[1] Add. MSS. 38,567, fo. 188.

[2] Rose, *Pitt and Napoleon*, 1912, p. 207. Cf. Carmarthen: "The Election went far more favourably to Government than its most sanguine friends could have imagined." *Pol. Memoranda of the Duke of Leeds*, ed. O. Browning, 1884, pp. 101–2.

[3] *Life of Wilberforce*, i, p. 64.

[4] Daniel Pulteney to the Duke of Rutland, 6 July, 1784. Hist. MSS. Comm., *Rutland Papers*, 1894, iii, p. 122.

India Company [1] played much the same part as the gold of Pitt in later and different circumstances. It " conjured up the storm," according to Walpole, that is, by propaganda, but when we admit propaganda we admit opinion, and that no contemporary is found to dispute. Opinion was expressed first and most emphatically in the addresses, then in the elections. And the appeal was to principles—to the position of the Crown and the two Houses—and to the personal credit of Pitt and Fox. The crisis was summed up retrospectively by a Whig as " Court intrigue and popular delusion," [2] by a Tory as the discovery and defeat of " Charles Fox's plan of governing the nation by an aristocracy with the aid of his India Bill . . ."[3] It would seem indeed to have been a political revolution too deep and too lasting to be explained as a skilful manœuvre carried through by borough manipulation and Treasury patronage, the inevitable basis of every election.[4]

[1] Mr. Philips has recently shown that the East India interest was divided and not wholly Pittite as had been previously believed. " The East India ' Interest ' and the English Government, 1783–4 ", *Trans. of the Royal Historical Society*, 1937, Fourth Series, xx, pp. 83 ff.

[2] Thomas Green, *The Diary of a Lover of Literature*, 1810, p. 113.

[3] Alexander Carlyle, *Autobiography*, 1860, p. 532.

[4] Cf. Wyvill's retrospective judgment on the crisis, influenced by his disapproval of the French War : " The danger apprehended from an oligarchical party in whose hands the immense patronage of India was to be placed, was indeed averted, but hence the Crown was enabled to lull the jealousy of the Public, gradually to recover a more extended influence than it had lost, and finally to obtain that decisive superiority which has annihilated Opposition, and while it preserved the forms has nearly destroyed the substance of the Constitution. The opposition of the public to this obnoxious measure was right and necessary ; but their confidence in the new Minister of the Crown was unwary and excessive, and in the course of his long Administration it has been productive of fatal effects." *Wyvill Papers*, iv, p. 361. Wilberforce records that owing to the crisis the Yorkshire Association lost sight of its original object—Reform—and stood for opposition to oligarchy in the persons of the great Whig lords, whose influence, combined with the cost of a contest in so large a county, had made Yorkshire the equivalent of a nomination borough. *Life*, i, pp. 51–3, 56–7. Cf. above, p. 165, n. 1.

INDEX

Abberbury, Robert, 78, 80.
Acts. *See* artificers, bubble, corn bounty, Grenville, mutiny, "pro camera stellata."
Aland, Fortescue, 31.
Aldermanbury, London, 162.
Alexander V, Pope, 84.
Alfred, king of England, 9.
Ambrosden, Oxfordshire, 27.
America and the mercantile system, 43, 64.
American Independence, War of, 43, 135, 156.
Anderida, fort of, 7 *n.*, 9.
Anderson, Evelyn, 163.
Andover, Hants, 15 *n.*
Andover, Viscount. *See* Howard, Charles.
Andred, forest of, 8–9.
Angles, the, 3, 7 *n.*
Anglesea, 152.
Anglia Sacra, 28.
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the, 9 *n.*
Anglo-Saxon Conquest, the (6th c.), evidence derived from the study of place-names, 2–19; Freeman's views, 2–3; Vinogradoff's views, 3.
Anne (of Bohemia), queen of England (wife of Richard II), 76–81.
Annual Register, the, 136, 164, 166.
Antonine Itinerary, the, 10.
Antiquaries, Society of, 34.
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 50.
Arden, forest of, Warwick, 6.
Argumentum anti-Normannicum (1682), 24.
Artificers, statute of (1563), 49.
Ashley, Sir William, 63.
Ashton, Mr., 33 *n.*
Asser, 29.
Atkinson, Richard, 165–6.
Atkyns, Sir Robert, 27.
Atterbury, Francis, bishop of Rochester, 31.
Atwood, William, 24 *n.*, 32.
Aubrey, John, 159.
Augustine, St., 95, 99.
Australia and the mercantile system, 53.
Avignon, France, 76, 94.

Bacon, Francis, 125.
Bagehot, Walter, 55.
Bagford, John, 34.
Baker, Mr., 123
Bale, John, bishop of Ossory, 26 *n.*
Baltic, the, 60.
Barbon, Nicholas, 43.
Baring, Alexander, 48.
Barnabas, St., 93.
Barroc, woodland, 8.
Bartoš, F. M., 72, 85.
Bastwick, John, 113, 119, 122, 124, 127, 129.
Batteley, John, 27.
Batteley, Nicholas, 27.
Beane, the, river, 15 *n.*
Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, 23–4, 29.
Bedfont, Middx., 16.
Bedford, 152. Duke of, *see* Russell, John.
Bedford, Hilkiah, 32.
Bedford, Thomas, 25 *n.*
Bedfordshire, 155 *n.*, 160.
Belfast, 151.
Belsham, William, 144, 147.
Bentham, Jeremy, 47, 50.
Bentinck, William Henry Cavendish, duke of Portland, 143–4, 159, 164.
Berkshire, 8, 152, 158. Earl of, *see* Howard, Thomas.
Bernard, St., 95.
Bernwood, Bucks, 15.
Bexley, Kent, 16.
Beverley, Yorkshire, 152, 163.
Bingham, Charles, earl of Lucan, 161–2.
Birmingham, 151.
Bismarck, Count Otto von, 64, 90.
Bitterfeld, Henry of, 74.

Blackburn, Dorothy, 123.
Blackburne, John, 161.
Bletchingley, Surrey, borough of, 159–60.
Boarhurst, Hants, 16.
Bodleian library, Oxford, 109, 111, 114.
Boethius, Anicius Manlius Torquatus Severinus, 33.
Bohemia, and the Roman Church (14th c.), 84; effect of revival of nationalism in (19th c.), 71; reform movement in, 71–102; relations between England and, 74–81; France and, 76, 78; the Holy Roman Empire and, 76; Luxemburg and, 76; Russia and, 90.
Bohemia, kings of. *See* Charles IV, Sigismund, and Wenzel.
Böhringer, Friedrich, 73.
Bolingbroke, Viscount. *See* St. John, Henry.
Bonaventura, St., 95.
Boniface IX, Pope, 83.
Boswell, James, 145.
Bowyer, Lodovick, 113, 121.
Brabourne, Theophilus, 128.
Bracton, Henry de, 30.
Bradley, Henry, 5, 11 *n.*
Bradwardine, Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, 102.
Brady, Robert, 25, 28–9, 35, 39.
Bramber, Sussex, 167.
Brancaster, Norfolk, 7 *n.*
Braybrooke, Robert, 78–80.
Braydon, Wilts, woodland, 9.
Brewster, Sir Francis, 51.
Brickhill, Bucks, 15.
Bridgnorth, Shropshire, 163.
Bridgwater, Som., 164.
Brill, Bucks, 15.
Bristol, 152, 156, 163.
Britons, the, 8.
Browne, Sir Thomas, 22.
Brunetière, Ferdinand, 33 *n.*
Bubble Act, the (1720), 66.
Bücher, Karl, 58.
Buckinghamshire, 147, 152, 158–9.
Buckle, Henry Thomas, 54.
Buddensieg, Rudolf, 73.
Bunbury, family of, 154.
Bunbury, Sir Thomas, 160.
Burke, Edmund, 134, 141, 147–8, 163.
Burleigh, Lord. *See* Cecil, William.
Burley, Simon, 77–80.
Burnett, Gilbert, 30.
Burton, Henry, 113, 119, 122, 124, 127, 129.
Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk, 163.
Bute, earl of. *See* Stuart, John.
Byng, George, 159.

Caedwalla, king of Wessex, 14 *n.*
Cairnes, John Elliott, 53.
Cambridge, 131; university of, 23, 33, 146, 161; *see* also St. John's College, Trinity College.
Cambridgeshire, 160.
Camden, Earl. *See* Pratt, Charles.
Camden, William, 22, 25.
Camden Society, London, 107–8.
Campodunum, 7 *n.*
Cannock, Staffs, woodland, 9.
Canterbury, 152, 156; archbishops of, *see* Bradwardine, Thomas; Juxon, William; Laud, William.
Caractacus, 53.
Carmarthen, 104.
Carmarthen, marquess of. *See* Osborne, Francis Godolphin.
Carnarvon, 151–2.
Cartwright, John, 143, 165.
Cavendish, Lord John, 144, 162.
Cavendish, William, duke of Devonshire, 161.
Cecil, William, Lord Burleigh, 62.
Chadshunt, Warwickshire, 16.
Chalfont, Bucks, 16.
Chamberlain, Joseph, 62.
Chambre, Giles de la, 79.
Charles I, king of England, 107, 109, 111, 115–17, 121, 125, 130.
Charles IV, king of Bohemia, 74, 76, 93.
Charles V, king of France, 76, 78.
Chatham, earl of. *See* Pitt, William.
Chauncy, Sir Henry, 27.
Cheapside, London, 120, 127.
Chester, 137, 152.
Chester, Mary, 128.
Chetwood, Bucks, 15.
Cheyne, Sir John, 79.
Chicago, 65.
Child, Sir Francis, 33 *n.*
Child, Sir Josiah, 43.
Chiltern Hills, 8.
Chute, Wilts, woodland, 9.
Cirencester, Glos, 10.
Clare, earl of. *See* Holles, John.
Clarendon, earl of. *See* Hyde, Edward.
Clayton, Sir Robert, 159.
Clement VII, Pope, 77.
Clumber, Notts, 14.

Coalition ministry, the (1783), 141, 146–7, 150–2, 157–60, 163.
Coke, family of, 154.
Coke, Sir Edward, 115.
Coke, Jane (wife of Thomas W. Coke), 154.
Coke, Thomas William, 138, 141, 154, 160.
Colchester, 7, 152, 155–6.
Collier, Price, 31, 32 *n.*
Common law courts, 117.
Compton, family of, 161.
Concilia, 22, 32.
Constance, Switzerland, 87–8, 90, 94.
Constantine, house of, 12 *n.*
Conway, Henry, 162–3.
Cooke, Edward, 24 *n.*
Corn bounty act (1689), 61–2.
Corn laws, the, 51.
Cornell university, Ithaca, U.S.A., 65.
Cornwall, 13, 18, 152, 158.
Cornwallis, Charles, Earl, 36.
Cossa, Luigi, 67 *n.*
Cotton, Isaac, 110.
Cotton, Robert Bruce, 22.
Cottonian library, the, 29.
Courts. *See* Common Law, High Commission, Star Chamber.
Coventry, 152, 156, 162.
Coventry, Sir John, 103–4.
Cowper, William, 159.
Coxe, Richard, 113.
Cracow, Poland, 74, 95.
Cracow, Matthew of, 74, 95.
Crespigny, family of, 163.
Crewe, John, 137.
Crococalanum, 6.
Cumberland, 18 *n.*, 158, 164.
Cunningham, William, 60–3.
Curzon, Assheton, Lord, 161.
Cynewulf, king of Wessex, 10 *n.*

Dagworth, Nicholas, 79–80.
D'Ailly, Jean, 85.
Dalton *v.* Beck, 121.
Dartmouth, earl of. *See* Legge, William.
Daubeny, George, 163.
Dauphin, the. *See* Philip.
Davenant, Charles, 43.
Denbigh, 152.
Derbyshire, 10 *n.*, 161.
Devon, 13, 152.
Devonshire, duke of. *See* Cavendish, William
Devonshire, Georgiana, duchess of, 150, 161, 165.
D'Ewes, Sir Simonds, 104–6, 131.
Dodsworth, Roger, 127.
Domesday Book, the, 10 *n.*, 29.
Doncaster, 151.
Dorchester, 6 *n.*, 15.
Dorset, 18, 159–60.
Dugdale, Sir William, 27, 31, 35.
Duncombe, Charles, 167.
Dundas, Henry, 153, 164.
Durham, 25, 152.

East India Company, 145, 164.
East Indian colonies, 60.
Economists, American, 64; English, 48, 53, 55, 61; French, 42; German, 55–6, 66.
Eden Treaty, the (1786), 48.
Edgar, king of the Mercians, 11 *n.*
Edgar the Atheling, 24 *n.*
Edinburgh, 47.
Egerton, Sir Thomas, 161.
Ekwall, Eilert, 1 *n.*, 8.
Eldon, Lord. *See* Scott, John.
Election of 1784, the general, Burke's views on, 135; characteristics of, 133–9, 157, 167–8; comparison between other 18th-c. elections and, 138; Foxite losses in, 135–8, 158–67; Foxite victories in, 161, 164–6; Laprade's views on, 133–6, 160; part played by addresses in, 138, 147–53; Fox's India Bill in, 141–7; patronage in, 145–7, 153–4; political issues in, 156–7; popular feeling in, 155–6; "Robinson's papers" and, 133–4, 138, 140–1, 153, 157–68; satirical prints and, 142, 149, 153, 157, 165. *See* also "*Fox's Martyrs.*"
Eliot, family of, 158.
Elizabeth, empress (wife of Charles IV), 78.
Elizabeth, queen of England, 65, 107, 109, 111, 113–17, 126.
Elliot, Sir Gilbert, 164.
Elmet, 7 *n.*
Elstob, Elizabeth, 37.
Elstob, William, 35.
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 32 *n.*
Emler, Josef, 72.
Empress. *See* Elizabeth.
Engelschalk, Albert, 74.
England and the mercantile state, 41–69; and the Roman Church (14th c.), 84; commercial treaty between Ireland and, 48; historical importance of the study of place-names in, 1–19; medieval

scholarship in (17th and 18th c.), 21–39; relations between Bohemia and, 74–81; France and, 76; Germany and, 77–8; the Holy Roman Empire and, 76–7; Italy and, 77.
England, kings of. *See* Alfred, Charles I, George I, George III, Henry VII, James I, Richard II, William the Conqueror.
England, queens of. *See* Anne, Elizabeth, Henrietta Maria.
Essex, 152, 159.
Euston, earl of. *See* Fitzroy, Henry George.
Evesham, Worcs, 103.
Exchequer, the, 108, 120.
Exeter, 152, 156.

Fägersten, A., 19 *n.*
Faulfiš, Mikuláš, 82, 88.
Feckenham, Worcs, forest of, 119.
Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 57.
Fielding, Henry, 140.
Finch, Sir John, 127, 129.
Fitzralph, Richard, archbishop of Armagh, 75
Fitzroy, Augustus Henry, duke of Grafton, 163.
Fitzroy, Henry George, earl of Euston, 146–7, 161.
FitzWilliam, William, Earl, 163–4.
Flajšhans, Václav, 72.
Fleet prison, the, London, 120.
Fletcher, Sir Henry, 158, 164.
Florence, Italy, 54.
Florinski, 90–1.
Foljambe, Mr., 158.
Fonthill, Wilts, 16.
Fontley, Hants, 16.
Fontmell, Dorset, 16.
Forests. *See* Andred, Arden, Kesteven, Lyme.
Fosse Way, 6.
Fovant, Wilts, 16.
Fox, Charles James, 133, 137–45, 147–9, 155, 157, 164–5, 168.
"Foxites," the, 136, 138, 141–2, 145, 149, 152–4, 157, 159–67.
Fox's Martyrs, 136–7, 157–8, 161.
France and the mercantile system, 42, 44; relations between Bohemia and, 76, 78; England and, 76; Luxemburg and, 76.
France, king of. *See* Charles V.
Freeman, Edward A., 2–3.
Free Trade. *See* Mercantile state.
Frisians, the, 3.
Fulman, William, 25.
Fylde, Lancs, 18 *n.*

Gale, Roger, 27.
Gale, Samuel, 27.
Gale, Thomas, 25, 39.
Gardiner, Samuel Rawson, 106–8, 120.
Gascoyne, Bamber, 161 *n.*
Gaul, 4, 84.
Gentlemen's Society, the, Spalding, Lincs, 34.
George, prince of Wales, 139.
George I, king of England, 38.
George III, king of England, 139, 142–3, 149, 151, 156–7, 160.
Germany and the mercantile system, 56–7, 59 *n.*; expedition of Gustavus Adolphus to, 60; relations between England and, 77–8; Russia and, 90.
Gibbon, Edward, 154–5, 162.
Gibson, Edmund, 22, 30, 34, 36–7.
Gilbert, John, bishop of Hereford, 78.
Gilferding, Aleksander Fedorovich, 90.
Gladstone, William Ewart, 49.
Glamorgan, 10 *n.*, 152.
Glanvill, Ranulf de, 30.
Glasgow, 47 *n.*
Gloucester, 156, 158–9.
Gloucestershire, 9, 27, 157.
Gordon, Lord George, 135.
Gournay, J. C. M. Vincent de, 43.
Gower, Earl. *See* Leveson Gower, Granville.
Grafton, duke of. *See* Fitzroy, Augustus Henry.
Greenvile, Sir Richard, 121.
Gregory I, Pope, *Moralia*, 94.
Gregory, Robert, 164.
Grenville, George Nugent-Temple, Earl Temple, 143, 149–50, 153.
Grenville, Thomas, 159.
Grenville, William, 159.
Grenville Act, the (1765), 135.
Grey, Charles, Earl, 137, 155.
Grigby, Joshua, 160.
Gustavus Adolphus, king of Sweden, 60.

Hacket, John, 131.
Hale, Sir Matthew, 22, 31, 131.
Halifax, 151. Marquis of, *see* Savile, George.
Halsey, Thomas, 159.
Hampshire, 9.
Harbin, George, 32.

Harbord, Sir Harbord, 154, 165.
Hardwicke, earl of. *See* Yorke, Philip.
Harley, Robert, 22.
Harris, John, 27.
Hartley, Winchcombe, 158.
Harwich, 163–4.
Hatton, Sir Robert, 103.
Havant, Hants, 16.
Hawkesbury, Baron. *See* Jenkinson, Charles.
Hayward, John, 24 *n.*
Hearne, Thomas, 22, 26, 29, 36, 38–9.
Heckscher, Eli Filip, 50, 64–5.
Heidelberg, 74.
Helfert, Joseph A., 73.
Hengest, 18 *n.*
Heming's Cartulary, 28.
Henrietta Maria (wife of Charles I), queen of England, 120, 123.
Henry VII, king of England, 106, 115, 117.
Hereford, Richard, 78.
Hert, William, 79–80.
Hertfordshire, 15 *n.*, 27, 156, 159–60.
Hewins, William Albert Samuel, 61–2.
Hickes, George, dean of Worcester, 22–4, 30–1, 33, 35, 37, 39.
High Commission, court of, 126–9.
High Cross, Leics., 6.
Higham Ferrers, Northampton, 164.
Hildebrand, Carl, 58.
Hill, Christopher, 68 *n.*
Hobert, George Vere, 165.
Hody, Humphrey, 30–1.
Höfler, Constantin, 73, 77, 81.
Hoke, Robert, 82.
Holdsworth, Sir William, 68 *n.*
Holkot, Robert, 95.
Holland, Thomas, earl of Kent, 78, 80.
Holles, John, earl of Clare, 130.
Holroyd, John Baker, earl of Sheffield, 154, 162.
Holy Roman Empire, the, and the Husite movement, 72 ; relations between Bohemia and, 76 ; England and, 77.
Hood, Samuel, Lord, 164.
Hotham, Sir Richard, 162–3.
Howard, Charles, Viscount Andover, 130.
Howard, Charles, earl of Surrey (afterwards duke of Norfolk), 158.
Howard, Theophilus, earl of Suffolk, 121.
Howard, Thomas, earl of Berkshire, 130.
Hudson, William, 109–10, 112, 115, 125.
Hull, Yorks, 152, 155–6, 163.
Humber, the, river, 8.
Hume, James Deacon, 43.
Hungary, king of. *See* Sigismund.
Huntingdon, 152.
Hus, John, Čech estimate of, 73, 88–9 ; contribution to the reform movement in Bohemia of, 72–3, 77 ; German estimate of, 73, 87–91 ; Russian estimate of, 90 ; use made of Wyclif's writings by, 81–3, 85–9 ; *see* also Husite movement.
Husite movement in Bohemia, the, comparison between the Wyclifite movement and, 92–3, 98–102 ; conflict between Slav and Teuton, 89–91 ; influence of early Čech reformers on, 92–102 ; influence of Wyclifite movement on, 73–4, 77, 79–89, 91–102 ; origin of, 72 ; sources for the study of, 73. *See* also Hus, John.
Huskisson, William, 49.
Hyde, Edward, earl of Clarendon, 104–6, 129, 131.

Impey, Sir Elijah, 136 *n.*
Ine, king of the West Saxons, 13–14, 30.
India and the East India Bill (1783), 145, 147.
Ireland and place-name studies, 4 ; commercial treaty between England and, 84.
Isner, Jan of, 74.
Italy and the Roman Church, 84 ; relations between England and, 77.

James I, king of England, 108, 110–11, 119.
Janova, Matěj z, 74, 76, 85, 90, 93, 96–8, 100–1.
Jebb, John, 141, 143.
Jenkinson, Charles, Baron Hawkesbury (afterwards earl of Liverpool), 155 *n.*, 167.
Jennings, Arthur Charles, 25.
Jenštejna, Jan z, archbishop of Prague, 74, 95.
John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, 78–9.

Johnson, Edgar Augustus Jerome, 65.
Johnston, Nathaniel, 27.
Jones, Richard, 56.
Joscelin, John, 22.
Junius, Franciscus, 22–3.
Jutes, the, 3.
Juxon, William, bishop of London (afterwards archbishop of Canterbury), 114, 126–7, 129.

Katkov, Mikhail N., 90.
Kemble, Glos, woodland, 9.
Kennet, White, 27, 31, 36.
Kent, 18, 156. Earl of, *see* Holland, Thomas.
Keppel, Augustus, Viscount, 156.
Kesteven, forest of, Lincs, 8.
Keynes, J. Maynard, 52.
Kilvert, Richard, 125–6.
King's College, London, 56.
Kinver, Staffs, woodland, 9.
Klicman, L., 72.
Kněhnic, Jiří z, 82, 88.
Knies, Carl Gustav Adolf, 57.
Kolína, Stěpán z, 97–9.
Kreyger, Conrad, 78–9.
Krofta, Kamil, 72.
Kybal, Vlastimil, 72.

Lamanski, Vladimir Ivanovitch, 90.
Lancashire, 18 *n.*, 152, 161.
Lancaster, duke of. *See* John of Gaunt.
Lancaster Herald, 79.
Lansdowne, marquis of. *See* Petty, William.
Lantgraf, Johannes, 80.
Laprade, William Thomas, 133–6, 160.
Latimer, Thomas, 80, 82.
Laud, William, archbishop of Canterbury, 121–2, 125, 127, 129.
Lausanne, 162.
Laws. *See* Corn, Navigation.
Lecky, William Edward Hartpole, 54, 133, 141–2.
Lee, Jack, 141.
Leeds, 151.
Legge, William, earl of Dartmouth, 146.
Leicester, 6, 152, 156.
Leighton, Alexander, 120–1, 124–5, 128–9.
Leire, Leicestershire, 6 *n.*
Leland, John, 22.
Le Mesurier, Paul, 163.
Lennox, Charles, duke of Richmond, 158.
Leominster, Herefordshire, 164.
Leslie, Cliffe, 55.
Leslie, David, Viscount Newark, 130.
Letocetum, 10–11.
Leveson Gower, Granville, Earl Gower, 159.
Lewes, Watkin, 165.
Lewisham, Lord. *See* Legge, William (afterwards earl of Dartmouth).
Liber Eliensis, 28.
Lichfield, Staffs, 11–12.
Lilburne, John, 114, 122, 124, 129.
Lincoln, 7, 17.
Lincoln College, Oxford, 23.
Lindum colonia, 17.
Lisle, André, 22.
List, Friedrich, 57.
Liverpool, 152, 156.
Lloyd, William, bishop of Worcester, 31.
Lollards, the, 78, 80. *See also* Wyclifite movement.
Londinium, 4.
Londinos, 4–5.
London, 6, 9, 23, 117, 120, 130, 151–2, 155–7, 164–6; bishop of, *see* Juxon, William; *the Gazette*, 151–2; university of, 107. *See* also Aldermanbury, Antiquaries, Society of, Camden Society, Cheapside, Fleet, the, King's College, Penge, Public Record Office, St. Paul's, Savoy, the, Southwark, Stock Exchange, Westminster.
London School of Economics, 61.
Lords' Journals, the, 130.
Loserth, Johann, 73, 81, 83, 85, 87–91, 101.
Lovat, the, river, 15.
Lowe, Dr. Elias Avery, 24 *n.*
Lowther, family of, 158.
Luard, Henry Richards, 25.
Lucan, earl of. *See* Bingham, Charles.
Luther, Martin, 31.
Luxemburg, relations between Bohemia and, 76; England and, 76; France and, 76. Wenzel, duke of, 76.
Lye, Edward, 38.
Lyme, forest of, Cheshire, 9.
Lyme Regis, Dorset, 103.
Lympne, the, river, 9 *n.*
Lytchett, Dorset, 10.

Macaulay, Thomas Babington, 54.
Macnamara, John, 136 *n.*

McCulloch, John Ramsay, 54
Madox, Thomas, 22, 27–8, 35–6, 39.
Magni, Nicholas, 74.
Mahon, Lord. *See* Stanhope, Charles (afterwards Earl Stanhope).
Mainwaring, William, 159.
Maldon, The Battle of, 29
Malthus, Thomas Robert, 52.
Malton, Yorks., 163.
Malvern, 15 *n.*
Mancetter, near Atherstone, 6 *n.*
Manchester school of economists. *See* Mercantile state.
Manduessedum, 6 *n.*
Manners, Charles, duke of Rutland, 143.
Mansfield, James, 161.
Margidunum, 6.
Marshall, Thomas, 22–3.
Marx, Karl, 56 *n.*
Marxism, 42.
Mason, William, 143.
Mawbey, Sir Joseph, 159.
Medieval scholarship, English (1660–1730), continuity of, 22; contribution of scholars to, 23–39; factors which contributed to the study of, 31–5, 37–8, value of record sources, for the study of, 28–9.
Melchet, Hants, woodland, 9.
Memoranda rolls, 108.
Mendip, Som., woodland, 9.
Menger, Anton, 57.
Mengotti, Francesco, 54.
Mercantile State, the, Adam Smith and, 42, 44–7, 52–5, 66; Bubble Act of 1720 and, 66; English economists and, 48, 53, 55, 61; free trade, 43; French economists, 42; German historical school, 55–61, 66; Heckscher and, 50, 64–5; Manchester school, 47–8, 57; meaning of, 41–2, 56, 66; method of enquiry into, 67–9; neo-mercantilism, 68; origin of, 42–3; physiocrats, 44–6; protectionists and, 43, 49, 62; Thomas Mun and, 46; William Cunningham and, 60–3.
Mercantilism. *See* Mercantile State.
Merchants' petition (1820), 48.
Mercians, king of the. *See* Edgar.
Middlesex, 135, 152, 155, 158–60; election of 1768, 156; of 1769, 156; of 1784, 149.
Midlands, the, 9.
Milič, Jan, 76, 85, 87, 94–6, 98, 100.
Mill, John Stuart, 52–3.
Mirabeau, Marquis de. *See* Riquetti, Victor.
Misselden, Edward, 65.
Monk, Mr., 123.
Monmouth, 158.
Montagu, Frederick, 164.
Montague, John, earl of Sandwich, 140, 152.
Morfe, Severn valley, woodland, 9.
Moravetz, Johannes, 75.
Morgan, a popish recusant, 121.
Moscow, 90.
Mottisfont, Hants, 16.
Mun, Thomas, 46, 56 *n.*
Mundy, Edward Miller, 161.
Mutiny bill, the (1784), 139.

Navigation Laws, the, 49, 60.
Neile, Richard, archbishop of York, 114, 122, 127, 129.
Netherlands, the, colonial war between Spain and, 60; economic condition of, 59.
Newark, Viscount. *See* Leslie, David.
Newcastle, 152. Duke of, *see* Pelham-Holles, Thomas.
Newmarch, William, 48.
Newnham, Nathaniel, 165.
Nicholls, John, 160.
Nicolson, William, 23, 24 *n.*, 27, 31, 36–7.
Norfolk, 138, 156, 160.
Norman Conquest, the, 4, 24, 31.
North, Sir Dudley, 43.
North, Frederick, Lord, 133–4, 141–2, 148–50, 156–7.
North, George Augustus, 163–4.
Northampton, 152, 161–2.
Northamptonshire, 156, 161.
"Northites," the, 140, 163.
North Sea, the, 4.
Northumberland, 152, 155.
Norton, Bonham, 121.
Norwich, 152, 154, 156, 164–5, 167.
Nova, Martin of, 76.
Novák, J. B., 72.
Novikov, Nikolai Ivanovich, 90.
Novotný, Václav, 72, 89.
Nowell, Laurence, 22.
Noy, William, attorney-general, 125.

Ockham, William, 85.
Odložilík, Otakar, 72.
Oldcastle, Sir John, 82–3.

Oldfield, Thomas Hinton Burley, 153–6, 158–60, 163.
Oncken, August, 57.
Ongley, Robert Hurley, Baron, 160.
Orange, house of, 60.
Osborne, Francis Godolphin, Marquess of Carmarthen, 137.
Osborne, George, 155 *n.*
Othona, Essex, fort, 7 *n.*
Ottley, Sir Francis, 33.
Oxford, 23, 74–5, 82, 152; Antiquity Hall, 34; university of, 23, 126. *See* also Bodleian library, Lincoln college, Queen's college, University college.

Palacký, František, 71–2, 77–9, 90.
Palmov, J., 90.
Pamber, Hants, woodland, 9.
Panchet, Wilts, woodland, 9.
Panslavism, 90.
Paris, university of, 74–5.
Parker, Matthew, 23.
Parliament, the Long (1640–60), 107, 119, 121, 124, 129. *See* also Election of 1784.
Parliamentary reform, 151.
Parr, Samuel, 146, 151.
Payne, Peter, 83.
Peel, Sir Robert, 49.
Pelham-Holles, Thomas, duke of Newcastle, 134.
Penchrich, river, 11 *n.*
Penge, London, 9.
Penk, the, river, 11.
Penkridge, Staffs, 11–12.
Penruddock, family of, 154.
Penryn, Cornwall, 163.
Pentrich, Derbyshire, 9–10.
Pentridge, Dorset, 9–10.
Pentyrch, Glamorgan, 10 *n.*
Percy, Lord Algernon, 155.
Perroy, Edouard, 77.
Peterborough, 25.
Peterborough, Benedict of, 29.
Petty, William, earl of Shelburne, afterwards marquis of Lansdowne, 158, 166.
Petyt, William, 32.
Philip, the dauphin, 78.
Phillips, Fabian, 30, 39.
Physiocrats, the. *See* Mercantile state.
Pickering, William, 122.
Pigot, Hugh, Admiral, 163.
Pileus de Prata, cardinal, 77, 79.
Pitt, William, earl of Chatham, 140.
Pitt, William (the younger), 133, 139–41, 143, 146–50, 153, 157, 161–2, 166–8.
"Pittites," the, 154, 158–60, 162–3, 165–7.
Place-names in England, difficulties of identifying British element in, 4–5, 9–12, 14; evidence as to survival of British population (6th c.), 1–12.
Plummer, Charles, 24.
Plymouth, 152.
Pole, Michael de la, 77–8, 80.
Popes. *See* Alexander V, Boniface IX, Clement VII, Gregory I, and Urban VI.
Portland, duke of. *See* Bentinck, William Henry Cavendish.
Portland, family of, 158.
Potus, Henricus, 80.
Prague, 74–5, 80, 82–3, 93, 97–8; university of, 74, 88, 93, 97.
Prague, Jerome of, 82.
Pratt, Charles, Earl Camden, 142–3.
Přemysl, duke of Teschen, 78–9.
Prideaux, Edmund, 103, 106, 117.
"Pro Camera Stellata," Act (1487), 106.
Prokop, the Great, 88.
Protection. *See* Mercantile state.
Pryme, Abraham de la, 27, 31, 33.
Prynne, William, 113, 119, 122, 124–9.
Public Record Office, London, 108–9, 112.
Pulteney, William, 145, 146, *n.*

Queen's college, Oxford, 23.
Quesnay, François, 42, 44.

Rǎňkŏv, Vojtěch, 75–6, 95, 100.
Ray, the, river, 15.
Reculver, 7 *n.*
Redford, Arthur, 47.
Reformation, the, 31, 72.
Restoration, the (1660), 22, 24, 30–2, 34–5, 38, 55, 65.
Revolution, the (1688), 36, 55, 143.
Revolutionary Wars (1789–1802), 48.
Reybutz, Henry of, 80.
Reynald, John, 79–80.
Ricardo, David, 50, 51 *n.*, 52.
Richard II, king of England, 76–80.
Richborough, Kent, 7 *n.*
Richmond, duke of. *See* Lennox, Charles.
Richmond, honour of, 27.
Rigby, Richard, 140.

Riquetti, Victor, marquis de Mirabeau, 44.
Rivers. *See* Beane, Lovat, *Penchrich*, Penk, Ray, Soar, Thames.
Robinson's Papers. *See* Election of 1784.
Robyns, Mephistosheth, 122.
Rochester, Kent, 164.
Rockhaus, member of suite of Anne of Bohemia, 81.
Rome, 94.
Rome, Ara Cœli, 87.
Romilly, Sir Samuel, 141.
Roscher, Wilhelm, 57–8.
Rose, George, 133, 164.
Rotherham, Yorks, 141, 151.
Roxburgh, 164.
Rud, Thomas, 25, 26 *n*.
Rushworth, John, *Historical Collections*, 108, 115, 125.
Russell, John, duke of Bedford, 160.
Russell, Lord John (afterwards Earl Russell), 149.
Russia and the Husite movement, 90; relations between Bohemia and, 90; Germany and, 90.
Rutland, 27. Duke of, *see* Manners, Charles.
Rymer, Thomas, 36; *Fœdera*, 22.

St. Albans, Herts, 152, 161.
St. John, Frederick, Viscount, 160.
St. John, Henry, Viscount Bolingbroke, 38.
St. John's college, Cambridge, Zodiac Club, 34.
St. Paul's Cathedral, London, 80, 135.
St. Victor, Hugo of, 95.
St. Victor, Richard of, 95.
Salisbury, 152.
Sammes, Aylett, 23, 30.
Sancroft, William, 31.
Sandwich, earl of. *See* Montague, John.
Saunders, Thomas, 112.
Savernake, Wilts, woodland, 9.
Savigny, Friedrich Carl von, 57.
Savile, George, marquis of Halifax, 32.
Savile, Sir George, 158.
Savile, Sir Henry, 22, 25.
Savoy, the, London, 78.
Sawbridge, John, 165–6.
Say, Jean Baptiste, 52.
Scarborough, 151.
Schism, the great (1378), 76, 79, 84.
Schmoller, Gustav, 59–60, 66.
Scotland and parliamentary reform, 151.
Scott, John, Lord Eldon, 164.
Scott, William Robert, 61.
Scotus, Duns, 85.
Seabright, Sir Edward, 123.
Sedlák, Jan, 72.
Segrave, Hugh, 78, 80.
Selden, John, 22, 25, 26 *n*.
Selwood, Somerset, 14.
Senior, Nassau, 49, 52–3.
Serra, Antonio, 56 *n*., 65.
Severn valley, the, 9.
Sheffield, Earl. *See* Holroyd, John Baker.
Shelburne, earl of. *See* Petty, William.
Sheridan, Richard Brinsley, 149.
Sheringham, Robert, 23.
Sherwood forest, Notts, 14.
Shropshire, 156.
Sigismund, Emperor, king of Bohemia and Hungary, 88.
Silchester, Hants, 10.
Sisam, Kenneth, 24.
Sithellius, member of suite of Anne of Bohemia, 81.
Skelton, Elfreda, 107, 111, 113, 115–17.
Skirlaw, Walter (later bishop of Coventry, Bath and Wells), 78–80.
Smith, Adam, 42, 44–7, 52–3, 55, 57, 66, 67 *n*.
Smith, Charles Loraine, 136 *n*.
Smith, John, 23–4, 29, 39.
Smith, Samuel, 162, 166.
Smith, Stooks, 135–6, 153.
Soar, the, river, 6 *n*.
Soltau, Konrad von, 74.
Sombart, Werner, 58.
Somerset, 9, 152, 156, 158.
Somner, William, 22–3, 27.
South African War (1898–1902), 62–3.
Southwark, London, 152, 159, 162.
Spain, and the Roman Church, 84; colonial war between the Netherlands and, 60.
Sparke, Joseph, 25.
Speenhamland system, the, 51.
Spelman, Sir Henry, 22, 30, 33.
Spencer, family of, 161.
Spencer, Margaret Georgiana, Countess, 150, 161.
Spinae, woodland, 10.
Stace, Freegift, 123.
Stafford, 136 *n*., 156.
Staffordshire, 9, 159, 164.

Stanhope, Charles, Lord Mahon, 147–8.
Stanhope, Spencer, 150, 163.
Star Chamber, the Court of (1630–41), bill for the abolition of, 103–5, 128–30; bill for declaring and regulating the power of, 104, 129; bill for the reforming of the proceedings of, 103; committee on, 103–6; comparison between procedure under the Tudors, and Stuarts in, 107, 111, 113–17, 123; co-operation between the court of High Commission and, 128–9; effect of the abolition of, 131; reasons for the abolition of, 105–7, 115, 117–18, 130; for the unpopularity of, 123–7, 130; sentences inflicted by, 118–23, 125–7, 129; sources for the study of the proceedings of, 107–12, 114–16, 118–19, 123, 125, 129.
Stephen, Leslie, 55.
Štítného, Tomáš ze, 75, 82, 95–6, 98, 100.
Steward, William, 119.
Stillingfleet, Edward, 22.
Stock Exchange, London, 50.
Stockholm, 64.
Story, Richard, 80.
Stow, John, 33.
Stowell, Sir John, 118.
Stříbra, Jakoubek ze, 101.
Stuart, John, earl of Bute, 150.
Stubbs, William, bishop of Oxford, 29.
Sturry, William, 77.
Sturt, Humphrey, 159.
Sudbury, Middlesex, borough of, 163.
Suffolk, 152, 154, 156, 160. Earl of, *see* Howard, Theophilus.
Sunderland, 151.
Surrey, 17, 152, 155–7, 159–60. Earl of, *see* Howard, Charles.
Suso, Henry, 95.
Sussex, 8–9, 17, 154, 158.
Swartes, John, 81.
Swartes, Walter, 81.
Sweden, king of. *See* Gustavus Adolphus.

Tabór, Bohemia, 95.
Taborite party, 83.
Tadcaster, 7 *n.*
Talman, John, 34.
Tanner, Thomas, 22, 39.
Tariff Commission, 62; reform, 62.
Tarleton, Banaster, 137.
Taunton, Som., 152.
Teffont, Wilts, 16.
Temple, Sir William, 24 *n.*
Temple, Earl. *See* Grenville, George Nugent-Temple.
Terry, W. H., 125.
Teschen, duke of. *See* Přemysl.
Thames, the, river, 8, 15.
Thoresby, Ralph, 27.
Thoroton, Robert, 27.
Thurlow, Edward, Lord, 149.
Thwaites, Edward, 23, 33.
Tolleshunt, Essex, 16.
Tomek, Václav Vladiraj, 72.
Tomline, Sir George Pretyman, 149.
Tories, the, 143.
Torkesey, William, 119.
Torre, James, 27.
Torrens, Robert, 52.
Totting, Henry, 74.
Townshend, George, Viscount, 161.
Toynbee, Arnold, 47 *n.*, 67 *n.*
Traske, John, 128.
Treaties. *See* Eden, Utrecht.
Trevelyan, George Macaulay, 106–7.
Trinity college, Cambridge, 161.
Trotman, Fiennes, 162.
Trotter, John Bernard, 148.
Tübingen, Germany, 60.
Tucker, Josiah, dean of Gloucester, 43, 153.
Turgot, Anne Robert Jacques, 43.
Turner, Sir Barnard, 162.
Twiss, Travers, 56 *n.*
Twysden, Sir Roger, 22, 25.
Tyburn, Middx, 33 *n.*

University college, Oxford, 78.
Unwin, George, 63.
Urban VI, Pope, 77.
Urchfont, Wilts, 16.
Ussher, James, 22.
Ulster, plantation of, 120; synod of, 151.
Utrecht, treaty of (1713), 68 *n.*

Václav. *See* Wenzel.
Vaughan (Vahun), Mr., 104.
Venice, 150.
Vere, Agnes de, 80.
Vere, Robert de, 80.
Vernemetum, 6.
Verney, Ralph, Lord, 159.
Verolamium, 6.
Vienna, 74–5.
Villa Faustini, 12.
Viner, Jacob, 65.

Vinogradoff, Sir Paul, 3.
Visconti, Catherine, 77.
Voltaire, 63.

Wake, William, 22, 31, 36–7, 39.
Wakefield, 151.
Waldhauser, Konrad, 74, 76, 93–4, 98.
Waldšteyn, Voks of, 83.
Wales, prince of. *See* George.
Walker, George, 123.
Wall, hamlet, 10.
Walpole, Horatio, 145, 165, 168.
Wanley, Humphrey, 22–4, 28–9, 34–5, 39.
Wansunt, Kent, 16.
Warburton, William, bishop of Gloucester, 37.
Wars. *See* American Independence, Revolutionary.
Wartenberg, Peter of, 78–9.
Warwick, 152.
Warwick, Sir Philip, 131.
Warwickshire, 6, 147.
Watling street, England, 6, 10.
Watson, Brook, 165.
Watson, Richard, bishop of Llandaff, 143, 147.
Watt, James, 47 *n.*
Wealth of Nations. *See* Smith, Adam.
Wendover, Bucks, 15.
Wenzel IV (Václáv), emperor and king of Bohemia, 76–80, 83–4, 99
Wessex, 8–9, 13–14. Kings of, *see* Caedwalla, Cynewulf, and Ine.
West Derby Hundred, 18 *n.*
Westminster, London, 79, 120, 152, 155–7, 162; Committee, 148; election of 1784, 135, 138, 150, 153, 164; Hall, 141.
Westmorland, 18 *n.*
Wharton, Henry, 25, 39.
Wheare, Degory, 34.
Wheloc, Abraham, 23.
Whigs, the, 68 *n.*, 140, 143, 146.
Wilberforce, William, 136, 140, 155, 158, 162–3, 167.
Wilkes, John, 135, 159, 166.
Wilkins, David, 39.
Williams, John, bishop of Lincoln, 117, 119, 125–7.
William the Conqueror, 24 *n.*, 25.
Wiltshire, 9, 14, 155.
Windebank, Sir Francis, 108, 123, 126, 129.
Windham, William, 165.
Windsor, 156.
Wise, Francis, 29.
Wiseman, Sir Richard, 122.
Wodehouse, Sir John, 155.
Wolverhampton, 11 *n.*, 151.
Wood, Anthony, 30 *n.*
Woodlands. *See* Barroc, Braydon, Cannock, Chute, Kemble, Kinver, Melchet, Mendip, Morfe, Pamber, Panchet, Savernake, *Spinae*.
Wootton Bassett, Wilts, 163–4.
Worcester, 152, 156, 162.
Wotton, John, 119.
Wraxall, Sir Nathaniel William, 162, 166.
Wray, Sir Cecil, 164–5.
Wright, Robert, 27.
Wright, Thomas, 119.
Wyche, Richard, 82.
Wyclif, John, influence on the Husite movement of, 73–4, 77, 79–89, 91–102; philosophical works of, 81; theological works of, 82. *See* also Wyclifite movement.
Wyclifite movement, the comparison between the Husite movement and, 92–3, 98–102; reasons for the decay of, 102. *See* also Wyclif, John.
Wyvill, Christopher, 141, 143, 144.
Wyvill Papers, 153.

Yelagin, 90.
York, 7 *n.*, 152, 155, 161–2. Archbishop of, *see* Neile, Richard.
Yorke, Philip, earl of Hardwicke, 160–1.
Yorkshire, 152, 158, 160; Association, 158, 168 *n.*; election of 1784, 136, 150, 167; reformers, 144, 151.

Zetles, Bernard van, 78–9.
Žižka, Jan, 88.
Zodiac Club. *See* St. John's college, Cambridge.
Zvířetic, Zdislav ze, 83.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL. SESSION 1936–1937

THE Council of the Royal Historical Society have the honour of presenting the Annual Report to the General Meeting of Fellows as follows :—

His Majesty King George VI, on ascending the Throne, was graciously pleased to grant his patronage to the Society.

The Society moved into its new premises at No. 96 Cheyne Walk, in July 1937. At its first meeting in the new rooms, on October 14, a paper was read by Miss E. Jeffries Davis on " The Historical Associations of Cheyne Walk, Chelsea " ; and the Council propose to issue the paper, with illustrations of the house and its neighbourhood, to the Fellows as a separate publication.

The Society's collection of the record series published by the local record societies has been made almost complete, and there have also been added to the library many of the individual record publications issued by counties, cities and boroughs. For these the Society has often been indebted to the generosity of the local authorities themselves. Further particulars will be found in the appendix to this report.

At the Annual General Meeting held on February 11, 1937, Professor F. M. Stenton was elected President of the Society on the retirement of Professor F. M. Powicke. The Vice-Presidents retiring under By-law XVII were A. E. Stamp and Professor F. M. Stenton. A further vacancy was caused by the death of Sir Richard Lodge. Professor J. H. Clapham, Dr. A. G. Little and Professor F. M. Powicke were elected Vice-Presidents to fill the vacancies. The Members of Council retiring under By-law XVII were A. L. Poole, Professor C. K. Webster, G. H. White and D. A. Winstanley. A further vacancy was caused by the expiration of the term of office of L. E. Tanner, co-opted under By-law XIX in May 1936. C. T. Clay, V. H. Galbraith, Professor Lillian M. Penson, L. E. Tanner and

Professor A. Hamilton Thompson were elected Members of Council.

By-laws XXIV and XXVIII were amended by the substitution of " second " for " third " in line 1, and By-law XXXIV was renumbered XXXVI and amended to read :—

> The Accounts of the Society shall be from time to time examined by the Council, who shall at the Anniversary Meeting lay before the Fellows an audited account and balance-sheet, together with a report on the general affairs of the Society during the preceding year.

By-laws XXXV and XXXVI were renumbered XXXIV and XXXV and By-law XXXVII was amended to read :—

> The Auditors shall be appointed by the Fellows at the Anniversary Meeting in each session and their remuneration shall be fixed by the Council.

The following papers were read during the Session, 1936–37 :—

" Bismarck and England in the Early Period of his Career." By Professor V. Valentin, Ph.D. (October 8, 1936.)
" Richard de Bury." By N. Denholm-Young, M.A. (November 12, 1936.)
" The Manning of the Navy in the West Indies : 1702–1763." By R. Pares, M.A. (December 10, 1936.)
" The Duke of Mar in Exile : 1716–1732." By M. W. Bruce, B.A. (January 14, 1937.)
" The Chronology of Labour Services." By M. Postan, M.Sc. (March 11, 1937.)
" Ranulf II, Earl of Chester." By H. A. Cronne, M.A. (May 13, 1937.)

The President, Professor F. M. Powicke, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A., delivered an address at the Anniversary Meeting on February 11, 1937.

The Alexander Medal was awarded to C. H. Philips, B.A., for an essay entitled " The East India Interest and the English Government, 1783–4."

The Presidential Address and the Alexander Essay with the above papers were printed in *Transactions*, Fourth Series, Vol. XX.

On October 29, 1937, there was published by Jonathan Cape, Limited, the first of the new series of annual biblio-

graphies of British history, *Writings on British History, 1934*, prepared for the Society by Mr. A. T. Milne, under the direction of the Bibliography (Annual) Committee. The volume is obtainable at a reduced rate by members and by subscribing libraries. The Council have entered into arrangements with the Mediæval Academy of America for the production of a new edition of Charles Gross's *Sources and Literature of English History* under the joint auspices of the two Societies, and have appointed the President and Professor F. M. Powicke as the representatives of the Society upon the Editorial Board. In order to secure the effective co-operation of the American Historical Association in the publication of the *Bibliography of British History, 1715–1789*, Dr. Stanley Pargellis, of Yale University, has been associated with Professor D. J. Medley as joint editor.

In addition to the volume of *Transactions* there were issued in January 1937, Camden Third Series, Volume LIII, *Robert Loder's Farm Journal, 1610–1620*, edited by G. E. Fussell; in July 1937, Volume LIV, *General and Provincial Chapters of the English Black Monks, 1215–1540*, Volume III, edited by W. A. Pantin; and in October 1937, Volume LV, *Memorials of the Holles Family, 1493–1656*, edited by A. C. Wood.

The following volumes of the Camden Series were in the press and almost ready for issue at the same date:—

John of Gaunt's Register, 1379–1383, 2 vols., edited by the late Eleanor Lodge and R. Somerville.

Early Charters of the Cathedral Church of St. Paul's, London, edited by Miss Marion Gibbs, with a preface by Professor Stenton.

British Diplomatic Representatives, 1509–1689, edited by R. B. Wernham.

Correspondence relating to Canning's Ministry, 1827, edited by A. Aspinall.

Besides these there were in immediate preparation in the Camden Series:—*Lieven Letters, 1832–1854*, Vol. I, edited by E. Jones Parry; a volume of *British Reports on Trade and Politics in Latin America, 1824–27*, edited by R. A. Humphreys; *The Commercial Correspondence of Lionel*

Cranfield, 1600–1609, edited by F. J. Fisher; a text of *Walter of Hemingburgh*, edited by H. Rothwell, and *The Camden Miscellany*, Vol. XVII.

The following volumes of the Miscellaneous Publications of the Society (New Series) were also nearly ready for press :— *British Chronological Materials*, edited by Professor F. M. Powicke; *Guide to British Commercial and Shipping Statistics, 1696–1782*, edited by Professor G. N. Clark; *Handbook of British Currency*, edited by A. E. Feavearyear.

On Thursday, July 4, the Society gave an afternoon party. The rooms of the Society were used during the Session for meetings of the British Archæological Association, the Canterbury and York Society, the Central London Branch of the Historical Association, the Huguenot Society of London, the Japan Society, the Lingard Society and the Royal Numismatic Society.

The Council have, with regret, to record the deaths of 19 Fellows during the Session, including Sir Arthur Doughty, a Corresponding Member since 1930, Lord Ernle, an Honorary Vice-President since 1917, Professor C. H. Haskins, a Corresponding Member since 1910, Professor Élie Halévy, a Corresponding Member since 1930, Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, a Corresponding Member since 1895, and Sir Frederick Pollock, a Member of Council from 1902 to 1910 and an Honorary Vice-President since 1910.

In addition, 11 Fellows and 2 Associates have been lost by resignation, 2 Fellows and 1 Library by removal from the roll for non-payment of subscriptions, and 3 Libraries by resignation. 30 new Fellows and 9 Associates were elected, 1 Fellow was reinstated and 5 Libraries were admitted as subscribing libraries.

The membership of the Society on October 31, 1937, was 907 Fellows, including Ordinary, Life, Honorary and Corresponding Fellows, and 38 Associates. There were 281 subscribing libraries. Of the Fellows, 3 were Honorary, 40 were Corresponding and 160 were Life Fellows.

The net result was a loss of 1 Fellow and a gain of

1 Library and 7 Associates. There were 39 Societies, British and foreign, which exchanged their publications with the *Transactions* and Camden Series of the Society.

The Treasurer reports that the total income of the year ended October 31, 1937, exceeded the expenditure chargeable against it by £215 2*s.* 5*d.*, but of this sum £100 has been allocated as a grant in aid of the production of the *Bibliography of British History, 1715–1789*. The amounts allocated to the Fund in aid of Pensions, the Library Account and the Publications Account have been included as expenses of the year and the surplus income is therefore carried, without further deduction, to the General Income and Expenditure Account. The Lease Renewal Fund, which at October 31, 1936, amounted to £1,201 7*s.* 10*d.*, will prove to be more than sufficient to cover the dilapidations and other expenses incidental to the termination of the lease of 22 Russell Square and the removal to 96 Cheyne Walk, and it has not therefore been necessary to make any allocation to this fund.

The Fund in aid of Pensions has been augmented by transferring from the accumulated Life Subscriptions a sum of £1,061 16*s.*, representing a free reserve in the latter account arising from the operation of By-law IX. It is anticipated that with accumulated interest the Pension Fund at its present figure will be amply sufficient for the purpose for which it exists and, therefore, no further allocations will be necessary.

The balance on the General Income and Expenditure Account representing the surplus of assets over liabilities and unspent allocations amounts to £3,174 1*s.* 4*d.*, compared with £3,493 7*s.* 5*d.* at the beginning of the year. The reduction is brought about by the removal to Publications Account of the balance of allocations for that account unspent at October 31, 1936.

The form of the accounts has been altered in order to show more clearly both the general distribution of the Society's expenditure and the state of the various separate

funds to which specific annual appropriations are made and of which the balances are carried forward year by year. In the first place, the separate Prothero Income and Expenditure and Capital Accounts have been dispensed with ; the whole of the Society's income and expenditure is now presented in a single general account, and the investments comprising the Prothero Bequest are shown in the Society's Balance Sheet. The books of the Society will continue to show the particular items which are charged to the income derived from the Prothero Bequest. Secondly, by renaming the accounts, a clearer distinction is established between what is now called the " Library (Reorganisation) Account," a capital account of moneys received from the sale of books withdrawn from the library, which will be wound up when the sales and replacements have been completed, and the ordinary Library Account dealing with the expenditure of the annual grant made for library purposes. Thirdly, the Publications Account, established by the Resolutions of Council of September 28, November 9, and December 14, 1933, and by the adoption of By-law XXXV by the Anniversary Meeting of February 8, 1934, is more fully set out than heretofore. There has, further, been made clear the establishment, out of the accumulated income of the Prothero Bequest, of a revolving fund for the production of the annual volume of *Writings on British History*. The appropriation of this surplus income constitutes a capital endowment to meet the cost of launching this new venture. It is the hope of the Council that, when the series is well established, it will pay for itself, and any profits derived from sales will be paid into the account, although none will accrue to the Society under the terms of the agreement for the publication of the first volume. But it is not the intention of the Council to make further appropriations to this separate Production Account.

In view of the growing complexity of the Society's affairs, and in accordance with the amendments to the By-laws adopted at the Anniversary Meeting of February 11,

1937, the account and balance sheet have been prepared and audited by the professional auditors appointed by the Fellows instead, as hitherto, by auditors chosen by the Fellows and the Council from among the members of the Society.

APPENDIX

(i) *The files of the publications of record societies added to the library in* 1935–36 *and listed in the Appendix to the last report have now been completed, with the exception of the following volumes :—*

British Record Society. *Index Library*, vols. XXXV and XLVI.
Somerset Record Society. *Publications*, vols. V–VII, XXVII and XXXV.
Southampton Record Society. *Publications*, vol. III.
Surtees Society. *Publications*, vols. III, XXV–XXVII, XXXIII, XXXV, XL, CXXI.

(ii) *There have been added to the library, together with a large proportion of the record volumes published by local authorities, the following further record society publications :—*

Bradford Historical and Antiquarian Society. *Local Record Series*, I–III, pt. 1 ; IV, pt. 1 (1929–37).
Cambridge Antiquarian Society. *Publications, Octavo Series*, XXXIV, XXXV, XL (1903–05).
Cantilupe Society. *Publications*, 1908, 1925, 1927 (1908–27).
Dugdale Society. *Publications*, I–XIV (1921–36).
Flintshire Historical Society. *Record Series*, nos. 1–2 (1924–29).
Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion. *Cymmrodorion Record Series*, I–XIII (1892–1936).
Huguenot Society of London. *Publications*, I–XXXVIII (1897–1937).
Newcastle-upon-Tyne Records Committee. *Record Series*, I–XI (1920–32).
South Wales and Monmouth Record Society. *Publications*, no. 1 (1937).
Thoresby Society. *Publications*, IV, VI, VIII, XXII (1893–1914).
Thoroton Society. *Record Series*, I, IV–VI, pt. 1 (1903–37).

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

I.—Income and Expenditure for the Year ended October 31, 1937.

Income.

			£ s. d.
Arrears of Subscriptions	£62 2 0		
Less Amount estimated to be received in last year's Accounts for subscriptions in arrear	35 0 0		
Subscriptions in arrear, received in excess of estimate			27 2 0
Subscriptions now in arrear, estimated to be received			35 0 0
Subscriptions of 1937 :—			
40 at 21s.	42 0 0		
281 at 30s.	421 10 0		
663 at 42s.	1,392 6 0		
			1,855 16 0
Life Subscriptions	92 8 0		
Less Proportion required by By-Law IX to be invested (see Balance-sheet)	61 12 0		
			30 16 0
Dividends on Investments and Tax recovered			210 18 0
Proceeds from Sale of Publications			100 5 0
Interest on Deposit Account at Bank			7 2 7
The Sir George W. Prothero Bequest :—			
Dividends and Interest on Investments	721 13 1		
Income Tax recovered	170 3 9		
Royalties	17 1 8		
			908 18 6
			£3,175 18 1

Expenditure.

			£ s. d.
Establishment Expenses :—			
Rent	£170 0 0		
Rates and Taxes	190 19 4		
Fire Insurance	10 10 0		
Repairs	12 8 9		
Wages	112 15 0		
Extra Service and Cleaning	8 5 8		
Lighting and Heating	36 8 2		
National Insurance	6 6 1		
Workmen's Compensation Insurance	3 7 3		
Monthly Meetings—Refreshments	14 14 0		
	565 14 3		
Less Rentals of parts of 22 Russell Square—let to tenants	295 3 8		
			270 10 7
Secretarial and Administrative Expenses :—			
Salary	400 0 0		
Pension Fund	200 0 0		
Typing	20 0 0		
General Printing and Stationery	54 19 10		
Accountancy and Audit	10 10 0		
Postages	41 19 3		
Telephone	12 2 5		
Sundries	23 0 3		
			762 11 9
Library :—			
Grant			100 0 0
Publications :—			
Director's Honorarium	150 0 0		
Salary of Assistant Officer	300 0 0		
Premium on Pension Fund for Assistant Officer	20 17 7		
Gross's *Sources*, 1st Instalment	100 0 0		
Grant for Publications	£1,100 0 0		
Add Proceeds from Sales	100 5 0		
	1,200 5 0		
Grants to Editors	35 9 9		
			1,806 12 4
Other Charges :—			
Alexander Medal	3 5 0		
International Congress	15 15 0		
Friends of National Libraries	1 1 0		
British Record Association	1 0 0		
			21 1 0
Balance, being excess of Income over Expenditure for the year			215 2 5
			£3,175 18 1

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

II.—Balance Sheet as at October 31, 1937.

Liabilities.			£ s. d.
Life Subscriptions required to be invested as Capital Account (By-Law IX) :—			
Amount brought forward from last Balance Sheet	£3,902 18 0		
Add Proportion of Life Subscriptions received in 1937 (see Income and Expenditure Account)	61 12 0		
	3,064 10 0		
Less Amount transferred to Fund in Aid of Pensions	1,061 16 0		
		2,002 14 0	
Lease Renewal Fund :—			
Balance from last Account	1,201 7 10		
Add Interest received and Tax recovered	36 5 6		
	1,237 13 4		
Less Expenditure to date, incident to removal	339 3 6		
		898 9 10	
Fund in Aid of Pensions :—			
Balance from last Account	1,399 1 4		
Add Cost of £198 19s. Australia 2¾% Stock, 1941/3	200 0 0		
Interest received and Tax recovered	45 7 2		
Amount transferred from Life Subscriptions	1,061 16 0		
		2,706 4 6	

Assets.			£ s. d.
Investments, viz. :—			
£699 9s. 9d. Consols 2½% valued at	in 1920	£314 0 0	
£300 Canada 3½% valued at	in 1920	200 0 0	
£900 India 3½% valued at	in 1920	500 0 0	
£272 8s. 6d. Australia 2¾% Stock, 1941/43, at cost		274 0 0	
£879 3s. 6d. Conversion Stock 5% at cost		826 3 1	
£1,220 Conversion Stock 4½% at cost		1,177 2 3	
£2,823 0s. 1d. Conversion Stock 3½% at cost		2,408 18 9	
£465 Local Loans 3% at cost		451 13 11	
£400 Metropolitan Water Board 4½% "D" Stock at cost		470 1 0	
500 National Savings Certificates at cost		400 0 0	
£643 4s. New Zealand 4% Stock, 1943/46, at cost		645 14 1	
			7,667 13 1
(Market value at October 31, 1937, £8,969 18s. 2d.)			
Cash at Bank : Current Account		433 7 2	
Deposit Account		1,384 6 6	
,, in hand		16 10 2	
			1,834 3 10

LIBRARY (REORGANISATION) ACCOUNT :—									
Balance from last Account					5	13	0		
Add Receipts from sale of books withdrawn					139	1	1		
					144	14	1		
Less Purchases and Binding					89	16	3		
								54	17 10
PUBLICATIONS ACCOUNT :—									
Amount transferred from General Income and Expenditure Account, being the excess of allocations for publications for 1933–34, 1934–35 and 1935–36, over the expenditure of those years					534	8	6		
Add Amount allocated for 1936–37					1,100	0	0		
Proceeds of Sales 1936–37					100	5	0		
					1,734	13	6		
Less Expenditure during the year			£874	18	1				
Add Amount owing to Printers, October 31, 1937			273	3	11				
			1,148	2	0				
Less Amount owing to Printers, October 31, 1936			841	0	0				
					307	2	0		
								1,427	11 6
LIBRARY ACCOUNT :—									
Balance from last Account					18	6	2		
Add Grant for the year					100	0	0		
					118	6	2		
Less Expended					129	16	7		
Amount overspent (see *contra*)					11	10	5		
				Carried forward				£7,089	17 8

STOCK OF PUBLICATIONS :—									
As at October 31, 1936								600	0 0
LIBRARY :—									
As at October 31, 1936								1,000	0 0
LIBRARY MANUSCRIPTS :—									
As at October 31, 1936								100	0 0
FURNITURE, ETC. :—									
As at October 31, 1936								300	0 0
LIBRARY ACCOUNT :—									
Amount overdrawn as *per contra*								11	10 5
				Carried forward				£11,513	7 4

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY—(*continued*).

II.—Balance Sheet as at October 31, 1937.

Liabilities.

		£ s. d.
Brought forward		7,089 17 8
Subscriptions Received in Advance		16 16 0
Amount Reserved as due to Printers		273 3 11
The Sir George W. Prothero Bequest :—		
Amount as at October 31, 1936	£21,651 16 8	
Add Profit on realisation of Investments	594 11 3	
		22,246 7 11
"Writings on British History": Production Account :—		
Surplus income on Prothero Fund at October 31, 1936, transferred	1,099 0 10	
Less Expenditure during the year :—		
Subsidy	£50 0 0	
Other charges	54 12 5	
	104 12 5	
		994 8 5
General Income and Expenditure Account :—		
Balance of accumulated income at October 31, 1936	3,493 7 5	
Less Amount transferred to Publications Account (see above)	534 8 6	
	2,958 18 11	
Add Excess of Income over Expenditure as per Account I	215 2 5	
		3,174 1 4
		£33,794 15 3

Assets.

		£ s. d.
Brought forward		11,513 7 4
Subscriptions in Arrear estimated to be received (see Income and Expenditure Account)		35 0 0
The Sir George W. Prothero Bequest :—		
Investments—As at October 31, 1936	£22,482 9 8	
Less Realisations	1,691 19 11	
	20,790 9 9	
Add Further Investments since	1,455 18 2	
		22,246 7 11
(Market value at October 31, 1937, £21,651 7s. 4d.)		
		£33,794 15 3

We have examined the foregoing Income and Expenditure Account and Balance Sheet with the Books and Vouchers of the Society. We have verified the Securities appearing in the Balance Sheet. We report that the above Balance Sheet is, in our opinion, properly drawn up so as to exhibit a true and correct view of the state of the affairs of the Society, according to the best of our information and the explanations given to us, and as shown by the books of the Society.

C. RYLAND BEEBY & CO.,
Chartered Accountants, Auditors.

66 Basinghall Street, London, E.C.2.
December 10, 1937.

THE DAVID BERRY TRUST.

Income and Expenditure Account for the year ended October 31, 1937.

Receipts.

			£ s. d.
To Balance in hand, October 31, 1936, brought forward from last Account, viz.:—			
Cash at Bank	£229 9 6		
„ in hand	2 6 1		
			231 15 7
„ Dividends on Investments per Charity Commissioners			45 10 6
			£277 6 1

Payments.

			£ s. d.
By Printing and Postages			1 10 0
„ Balance in hand, October 31, 1937, carried forward, viz.:—			
Cash at Bank	£273 18 6		
„ in hand	1 17 7		
			275 16 1
			£277 6 1

We have examined the above account and find it correct.

C. Ryland Beeby & Co.,
Chartered Accountants,
Auditors.

66 Basinghall Street,
London, E.C.2.
December 10, 1937.

ALEXANDER PRIZE

The Alexander Prize was established in 1897 by L. C. Alexander, F.R.Hist.S. It consists of a Silver Medal awarded annually for an essay upon some historical subject. Candidates may select their own subject provided such subject has been previously submitted to and approved by the Literary Director. The essay must be a genuine work of original research, not hitherto published, and one which has not been awarded any other prize. It must not exceed 6,000 words in length and must be sent in on or before February 28th, 1939.

LIST OF ALEXANDER PRIZE ESSAYISTS (1898–1938) [1]

1898. F. Hermia Durham (" The Relations of the Crown to Trade under James I ").
1899. W. F. Lord, B.A. (" The Development of Political Parties in the reign of Queen Anne ").
1901. Laura M. Roberts (" The Peace of Lunéville ").
1902. V. B. Redstone (" The Social Condition of England during the Wars of the Roses ").
1903. Rose Graham (" The Intellectual Influence of English Monasticism between the tenth and twelfth centuries ").
1904. Enid W. G. Routh (" The Balance of Power in the Seventeenth Century ").
1905. W. A. P. Mason, M.A. (" The Beginnings of the Cistercian Order ").
1906. Rachel R. Reid, M.A. (" The Rebellion of the Earls, 1569 ").
1908. Kate Hotblack (" The Peace of Paris, 1763 ").
1909. Nellie Nield, M.A. (" The Social and Economic Condition of the Unfree Classes in England in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries ").

[1] No award was made in 1900, 1907, 1910, 1911, 1913, 1914, 1921. The prize Essays for 1909 and 1919 were not published in the *Transactions*. No Essays were submitted in 1915 and 1916.

1912. H. G. Richardson (" The Parish Clergy of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries ").
1917. Isobel D. Thornley, B.A. (" The Treason Legislation of 1531–1534 ").
1918. T. Plucknett, B.A. (" The Place of the Council in the Fifteenth Century ").
1919. Edna F. White, M.A. (" The Jurisdiction of the Privy Council under the Tudors ").
1920. J. E. Neale, M.A. (" The Commons Journals of the Tudor Period ").
1922. C. E. Martin (" The English Establishments on the Gold Coast in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century ").
1923. E. W. Hensman, M.A. (" The Civil War of 1648 in the East Midlands ").
1924. Grace Stretton, B.A. (" Some Aspects of Mediæval Travel ").
1925. F. A. Mace, M.A. (" Devonshire Ports in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries ").
1926. Marian J. Tooley, M.A. (" The Authorship of the *Defensor Pacis* ").
1927. W. A. Pantin, B.A. (" Chapters of the English Black Monks, 1215–1540 ").
1928. Gladys A. Thornton, B.A., Ph.D. (" A Study in the History of Clare, Suffolk, with special reference to its development as a Borough ").
1929. F. S. Rodkey, A.M., Ph.D. (" Lord Palmerston's Policy for the Re-juvenation of Turkey, 1839–47 ").
1930. A. A. Ettinger, D.Phil. (" The Proposed Anglo-Franco-American Treaty of 1852 to guarantee Cuba to Spain ").
1931. Kathleen A. Walpole, M.A. (" The Humanitarian Movement of the Early Nineteenth Century to Remedy Abuses on Emigrant Vessels to America ").
1932. Dorothy M. Brodie, B.A. (" Edmund Dudley, Minister of Henry VII ").
1933. R. W. Southern, B.A. (" Ranulf Flambard and Early Anglo-Norman Administration ").
1934. S. B. Chrimes, M.A., Ph.D. (" Sir John Fortescue and his Theory of Dominion ").
1935. S. T. Bindoff, M.A. (" The Unreformed Diplomatic Service, 1812–60 ").
1936. Rosamond J. Mitchell, M.A., B.Litt. (" English Students at Padua, 1460–1475 ").
1937. C. H. Philips, B.A. (" The East India Company ' Interest,' and the English Government, 1783–4 ").
1938. H. E. I. Phillips, B.A. (" The Last Years of the Court of Star Chamber, 1630–41).

DAVID BERRY PRIZE

The David Berry Prize was established in 1929 by David Anderson-Berry in memory of his Father the Reverend David Berry. It consists of a Gold Medal and Money Prize awarded every three years for Scottish History. Candidates may select any subject dealing with Scottish History within the reigns of James I to James VI inclusive, provided such subject has been previously submitted to and approved by the Council of the Royal Historical Society. The Essay must be a genuine work of original research not hitherto published, and one which has not been awarded any other prize. There is no limit to the length of the Essay. It must be sent in on or before October 31st, 1940.

PRIZE ESSAYIST, 1937 COMPETITION

G. Donaldson, M.A. ("The Polity of the Scottish Reformed Church, *c.* 1560–1580, on the Rise of the Presbyterian Movement").

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

(INCORPORATED BY ROYAL CHARTER)

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL—1938–39.*

Patron.

HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

President.

PROFESSOR F. M. STENTON, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A.

Honorary Vice-Presidents.

PROFESSOR SIR RAYMOND BEAZLEY, J.P., M.A., D.Litt.
SIR REGINALD BLOMFIELD, R.A., M.A., D.Litt., F.S.A.
J. F. CHANCE, M.A. (died 18 Oct., 1938).
THE RIGHT HON. WINSTON S. CHURCHILL, C.H., M.P.
THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF GLOUCESTER, D.D., Litt.D., F.S.A. (died 23 Dec., 1938).
G. P. GOOCH, D.Litt., Litt.D., F.B.A.
PROFESSOR A. J. GRANT, M.A., Litt.D.
THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF ILCHESTER.
PROFESSOR SIR JOHN LLOYD, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A.
PROFESSOR SIR CHARLES OMAN, M.P., LL.D., D.C.L., F.B.A., F.S.A
A. F. POLLARD, D.Litt., D.Lit., Litt.D., F.B.A.
R. L. POOLE, LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A.
R. A. ROBERTS.
PROFESSOR G. M. TREVELYAN, O.M., Litt.D., F.B.A.
THE REV. PROFESSOR J. P. WHITNEY, D.D., D.C.L.
PROFESSOR G. M. WRONG, M.A., LL.D.

Vice-Presidents.

CHARLES JOHNSON, M.A., F.B.A., F.S.A.
MISS ROSE GRAHAM, M.A., D.Litt., F.S.A.
PROFESSOR A. P. NEWTON, M.A., D.Lit., F.S.A.
J. H. CLAPHAM, C.B.E., Litt.D., F.B.A.
A. G. LITTLE, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A.
PROFESSOR F. M. POWICKE, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A.

* The previous list of Officers and Council was headed "1936–7," since, from *Transactions*, Fourth Series, ii (1919) onwards, the practice has been to head the list "1918–9" [etc.] although it has been corrected to 31 October 1919 [etc.]. But the list for 1937–8 corrected to 31 October 1938 is of course the list for 1938–9, and it is now so dated. A similar error was made in the dating of the lists in *Transactions*, New Series, xvii (1903)—xix (1905), and Third Series, iv (1910) and vii (1913).

Vice-Presidents—continued.

A. E. Stamp, C.B., M.A., F.S.A. (died 4 March 1938).
Professor C. K. Webster, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A.
Professor A. F. B. Williams, M.A., F.B.A. (elected under By-law XIX).

Council.

C. S. B. Buckland, M.A., D.Litt.
Professor D. C. Douglas, M.A.
A. V. Judges, B.A.
A. Aspinall, M.A., Ph.D.
Miss H. M. Cam, M.A.
R. R. Darlington, B.A., Ph.D.
R. Pares, M.A.
C. T. Clay, M.A., F.S.A.
Professor Lillian M. Penson, Ph.D.
L. E. Tanner, M.V.O., M.A., F.S.A.
Professor A. Hamilton Thompson, C.B.E., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A.
Miss E. M. Jamison, M.A.
L. C. Loyd, B.A.
Professor C. W. Previté-Orton, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A.
B. H. Sumner, M.A.
Professor A. S. Turberville, M.C., M.A., B.Litt.

Honorary Secretary.

Professor H. Hale Bellot, M.A.

Literary Directors.

Hubert Hall, Litt.D., F.S.A. (retired 31 Oct. 1938).
C. R. Cheney, M.A.
A. V. Judges, B.A. } (as from 1 November 1938).

Honorary Treasurer.

M. S. Giuseppi, I.S.O., F.S.A.

Assistant Secretary and Librarian.

Miss M. B. Curran, M.A.

Assistant Officer and Junior Librarian.

A. T. Milne, M.A.

Library and Offices.

96 Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, S.W.10.

Bankers.

Barclays Limited.

STANDING COMMITTEES—1938-39.*

Finance Committee.

A. Aspinall, M.A., Ph.D.
C. S. B. Buckland, M.A., D.Litt.
A. H. Cheney.
C. Johnson, M.A., F.B.A., F.S.A.
Professor Lillian M. Penson, Ph.D.
Professor F. M. Stenton, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., *President.*
A. V. Judges, B.A., *Literary Director.*
M. S. Giuseppi, I.S.O., F.S.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*
Professor H. Hale Bellot, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Library Committee.

C. T. Clay, M.A., F.S.A.
Miss E. M. Jamison, M.A.
C. Johnson, M.A., F.B.A., F.S.A.
C. G. Parsloe, B.A.
Professor F. M. Stenton, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., *President.*
C. R. Cheney, M.A.
A. V. Judges, B.A. } *Literary Directors.*
M. S. Giuseppi, I.S.O., F.S.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*
Professor H. Hale Bellot, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Publication Committee.

Miss H. M. Cam, M.A.
Professor D. C. Douglas, M.A.
Miss Rose Graham, M.A., D.Litt., F.S.A.
Professor F. M. Powicke, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A.
B. H. Sumner, M.A.
M. A. Thomson, M.A., D.Phil.
Professor C. K. Webster, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A.
Professor C. H. Williams, M.A.
Professor F. M. Stenton, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., *President.*
C. R. Cheney, M.A.
A. V. Judges, B.A. } *Literary Directors.*
M. S. Giuseppi, I.S.O., F.S.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*
Professor H. Hale Bellot, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Bibliography (Annual) Committee.

A. Aspinall, M.A., Ph.D.
C. S. B. Buckland, M.A., D.Litt.
Miss H. M. Cam, M.A.
Professor William Rees, M.A., D.Sc.
Professor F. M. Stenton, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., *President.*
C. R. Cheney, M.A.
A. V. Judges, B.A. } *Literary Directors.*
M. S. Giuseppi, I.S.O., F.S.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*
Professor H. Hale Bellot, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

* Down to 31 Oct. 1938, Dr. Hubert Hall was, as Literary Director, a member of these committees, and Mr. A. V. Judges was an ordinary member of the Finance, Publication and Bibliography Committees.

LIST OF FELLOWS OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY (CORRECTED TO 31 OCTOBER 1938).

Names of Officers and Members of Council are printed in SMALL CAPITALS. *Those marked * have compounded for their Annual Subscriptions.*

* Abbott, Rev. H. A., M.A., L.C.P., Palmer's School, Grays, Essex.
Adair, E. R., M.A., McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
Adler, E. N., 20 Porchester Square, W.2.
Ady, Miss C. M., M.A., D.Litt., 40 St. Margaret's Road, Oxford.
Ahmad, Mohammad Basheer, M.A., I.C.S., Judge's House, Rai Bareli., U.P., India.
Ainley, Rev. B. S., B.A., St. Augustine's Vicarage, 26 Nottingham Road, New Basford, Nottingham.
Albion, Rev. Gordon, D.Sc. (Louvain), St. John's Seminary, Wonersh, Guildford.
Allen, B. M., M.A., 345 St. Ermin's, Westminster, S.W.1.
Allen, Miss H. E., A.B., A.M., Kenwood, Oneida, N.Y., U.S.A.
Anderson, A. K., M.A., The Scots College, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
Anderson, Professor F. M., M.A., Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H., U.S.A.
* Anderson, R. C., M.A., Litt.D., Basset Holt, Southampton.
Andrews, Rev. P. J., 63 Tufton Street, S.W.1.
Armstrong, C. A. J., B.A., Hertford College, Oxford.
Artz, Professor F. B., Ph.D., 131 Forest Street, Oberlin, Ohio, U.S.A.
Arundale, The Right Rev. G. S., M.A., LL.B., D.L., 10 Buckingham Street, Buckingham Gate, S.W.1.
Ashdown, Mrs. Charles H., The Green, Kirby Moorside, Yorks.
* ASPINALL, A., M.A., Ph.D., 33 Grosvenor Road, Caversham, nr. Reading.
Atiya, Aziz Suryal, M.A., Ph.D., 9 Sh. el-Madrassah el-Tewfikieh, Shoubra, Cairo, Egypt.
Atkinson, C. T., M.A., Exeter College, Oxford.
Atkinson, Professor D., M.A., F.S.A., 28 Queens Road, West Didsbury, Manchester.
Atkinson, R. L., M.A., Upper Portesbery, Camberley, Surrey.
Attlee, Rev. B. H. B., D.D., St. Cross Vicarage, Holywell, Oxford.
Auchmuty, J. J., M.A., Ph.D., 9 Lad Lane, Dublin.
* Auden, Miss Henrietta M., Alderdene, Church Stretton, Salop.

Bagshawe, T. W., F.S.A., Hill Wood, Dagnall, nr. Berkhamsted.
Baker, Lieut.-Colonel B. G., J.P., D.S.O., F.R.G.S., St. Mary's Road, Beccles, Suffolk.
Baker, G. P., Marigold Corner, Elmer Beach, Bognor Regis.
Baldwin, Professor J. F., Ph.D., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y., U.S.A.
Bales, P. G., M.C., M.A., 4 Bass Terrace, Thorne Road, Doncaster.
Balfour-Melville, E. W. M., M.A., 2 South Learmonth Gardens, Edinburgh.

Banks, Mrs. M. M., 16 Hornton Court, Hornton Street, W.8.
Barnard, E. A. B., M.A., F.S.A., 26 Warkworth Street, Cambridge.
Barnes, Professor D. G., M.A., Ph.D., Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A.
Barnes, Professor Viola F., M.A., Ph.D., Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass., U.S.A.
Baskerville, G., M.A., Crowsley Park, Henley-on-Thames.
Bate, G. E., 55 Harvard Road, Spring Grove, Isleworth, Middlesex.
* Bayley, A. R., B.A., Cotford, Graham Road, Great Malvern.
Bayne-Powell, Mrs. R., Brockhill, Broad Clyst, Exeter.
Bazeley, Miss M. L., M.A., B.D., 113 North Side, S.W.4.
Beardwood, Miss Alice, B.A., B.Litt., D.Phil., 415 Miller's Lane, Wynnewood, Penna., U.S.A.
Beazley, Professor Sir Raymond, J.P., D.Litt., 6 Arthur Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham.
Beer, E. S. de, M.A., 11 Sussex Place, N.W.1.
* Beet, Rev. W. E., M.A., D.Litt., Charisma, Castle Road, Saltwood, Hythe.
Begley, W. W., 30 Rylandes Road, Croham Heights, Selsdon, Surrey.
Behrens, Miss C. B. A., B.A., Bailey Hill, Denham, Bucks.
* Bell, Lieut.-Commander A. C., R.N., Bushypark House, Ennis, Co. Clare.
Bell, Professor Herbert C., Ph.D., 22 Wyllys Avenue, Middletown, Conn., U.S.A.
Beller, E. A., D.Phil., Ridgeview Road, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.
Bellot, Professor H. H., M.A. (*Hon. Secretary*), 9 Well Walk, N.W.3.
Benham, Sir W. Gurney, F.S.A., Westfield, 14, Lexden Road, Colchester.
Benjamin, Professor G. G., M.A., Ph.D., University of South California, University Park, Los Angeles, Cal., U.S.A.
Benns, Professor F. Lee, Ph.D., 320 North Jordan Avenue, Bloomington, Indiana, U.S.A.
Bentliff, E. D., M.A., 34 Princes Avenue, Great Crosby, nr. Liverpool.
Bère, Professor R. de la., M.A., R.A.F. College, Cranwell, Lincs.
Berkeley, G. F. H., J.P., B.A., Hanwell Castle, Banbury.
Betts, Professor R. R., B.A., University College, Southampton.
Beveridge, Sir William H., K.C.B., LL.D., B.C.L., F.B.A., The Masters' Lodgings, University College, Oxford.
Billingham, P. H., M.A., B.Litt., Yardley House, Miles Road, Clifton, Bristol.
Bing, H. F., M.A., The Folk House, College Green, Bristol, 1.
Birch, F. L., M.A., 11 Montpelier Row, S.W.7.
Black, Professor J. B., M.A., The University, Aberdeen.
Blake, A. H., M.A., Authors' Club, 2 Whitehall Court, S.W.1.
* Blakey, Professor R. G., Ph.D., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., U.S.A.
* Blomfield, Sir Reginald, R.A., M.A., Litt.D., D.Litt., F.S.A., 51 Frognal, N.W.3.
Boak, Professor E. R., Ph.D., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., U.S.A.
Boase, Professor T. S. R., M.C., M.A., Courtauld Institute of Art, 20 Portman Square, W.1.

Bolam, Rev. Canon C. E., Willoughby Rectory, Alford, Lincs.
Bond, Professor B. W., Ph.D., University of Cincinnati, McMicken Hall, Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A.
Bourdillon, Miss A. F. C., M.A., Barnett House, Oxford.
Bourne, Professor H. E., B.D., LL.D., L.H.D., 2504 Derbyshire Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio., U.S.A.
Boyd, Allen R., Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
Bracey, The Very Rev. R., St. Dominic's Priory, Carisbrooke, Isle of Wight.
Bradyll-Johnson, Rev. L., M.A., D.D., 6 Park Lane, Milford on Sea, Hants.
* Brebner, Professor J. B., M.A., B.Litt., Ph.D., Columbia University, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.
Brendon, J. A., B.A., England's Side, Queen Camel, Somerset.
Bridge, J. S. C., Cookley House, Henley-on-Thames.
Brinton, Crane, B.A., D.Phil., J24 Dunster House, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Brodie, Miss D. M., B.A., Ph.D., Newnham College, Cambridge.
Brogan, D. W., M.A., Kybald Twychen, Kybald Street, Oxford.
Brooke, Z. N., M.A., Litt.D., Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.
Brooks, F. W., M.A., University College, Hull.
Broome, Miss D. M., Ph.D., 37 Ashburn Road, Stockport.
*Brown, A. E., M.A., LL.B., Brooklyn, Cherry Hinton Road, Cambridge
Brown, B. Goulding, M.A., 16 Brookside, Cambridge.
Brown, Rev. G. K., B.A., Ph.D., D.Litt., 99 Belgrave Road, Darwen, Lancs.
Brown, Professor Louise F., Ph.D., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y., U.S.A.
Brown, W. E., M.A., B.Sc., 53 South Park Avenue, Glasgow.
Browning, Professor Andrew, M.A., Westdel, Queen's Place, Glasgow, W.2.
Bryant, A. W. M., M.A., The White House, East Claydon, Bucks.
Buckland, C. S. B., M.A., D.Litt., 16 Downside Crescent, N.W.3.
Buckland, Professor W. W., LL.D., D.C.L., F.B.A., 9 Grange Road, Cambridge.
Buckler, Professor F. W., M.A., The Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio, U.S.A.
Bullock, Lieut.-Colonel Humphry, Headquarters Northern Command, Rawalpindi, India.
Burleigh, Rev. Professor J. H. S., B.D., The University, Edinburgh, 10.
Burman, J., Greenfields, Hampton Lane, Solihull, Warwickshire.
Burn, W. L., M.A., The Barn House, Little Homead, Buntingford, Herts.
Bury, J. P. T., M.A., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.
* Busher, Rev. T. Story, D.D., M.A., The Rectory, Charlton-on-Otmoor, Oxford.
Bushnell, G. H., F.S.P., University Library, St. Andrews, Fife.
Butchers, A. G., M.A., LL.B., Litt.D., 18 Wilford Street, Lower Hutt, Wellington, New Zealand.
Butler, H. M., M.A., Queen Mary's School, Walsall.
Butler, J. R. M., M.V.O., O.B.E., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Butler, Wilson, M.A., LL.M., Glebelands, Broughton-in Furness.

Butt-Thompson, Captain F. W., Redecourt, Esher Avenue, Walton-on-Thames.
Butterfield, Mrs., M.A., Congreve Park, Spanish Town, P.O., Jamaica, B.W.I.

* Callender, Professor Sir G. A. R., M.A., F.S.A., National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, S.E.10.
Calthrop, Miss M. M. C., 26 Maitland Park Road, N.W.3.
* Cam, Miss H. M., M.A., Girton College, Cambridge.
Cameron, Miss J., B.A., 806 Grenville House, Dolphin Square, S.W.1.
Cammaerts, Professor Emile, Quadrant House, Pall Mall, S.W.1.
* Campbell, Miss A. M., A.M., Ph.D., New Jersey College for Women, New Brunswick, N.J., U.S.A.
Campbell, Vice-Admiral G., V.C., D.S.O. (retired), 43 Fellows Road, N.W.3.
Campbell, Miss Sybil, M.A., 2 Brick Court, Temple, E.C.4.
Cape, H. J., M.A., B.Sc., The Old Rectory, Markshall, near Coggeshall, Essex.
* Carlyle, E. I., M.A., Lincoln College, Oxford.
Carrier, Miss E. H., M.A., M.Sc., Avery Hill College, Eltham, S.E.9.
Carruthers, Mrs. C. H., 8 Gower Street, W.C.1.
Carter, Professor C. E., Ph.D., Department of State, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
* Carter, Rev. C. S., D.D., Clifton Theological College, Stoke Bishop, Bristol.
Cartlidge, Rev. S. E. G., The Vicarage, Oakengates, Salop.
* Cecil, Algernon, M.A., 43 Bryanston Square, W.1.
Chacko, C. J., M.A., Ph.D., Ewing Hall, Forman Christian College, Lahore, Punjab, India.
Chamberlin, Frederick, LL.B., F.S.A., 22 Alleyn Road, S.E.21.
Chambers, Miss A. M., Girls' Grammar School, Hitchin.
Chandler, P. W., F.S.A., Lee Cottage, Medmenham, Marlow, Bucks.
Chapin, H. M., A.B., 93 Brown Street, Providnce, R.I., U.S.A.
* Charleston, Lektor S. J., M.A., Handelshögskolan, Sveavägen 65, Stockholm, Sweden.
Charnwood, Lord, M.A., D.L., 108 Eaton Square, S.W.1.
* Chart, D. A., I.S.O., Litt.D., 35 Sans Souci Park, Belfast.
Cheney, A. H., 27 Serpentine Road, Sevenoaks.
Cheney, C. R., M.A. (*Literary Director*), Wadham College, Oxford.
Chew, Miss H. M., M.A., Ph.D., 115 Erskine Hill, N.W.11.
Chitty, Herbert, M.A., F.S.A., 26 Ladbroke Square, W.11.
Chrimes, S. B., M.A., Ph.D., The University, Glasgow.
* Christie, Mrs., Gatlands, Ditchling, Sussex
Church, Rev. L. F., B.A., Ph.D., Helvellyn, 63 Higher Drive, Banstead, Surrey.
Churchill, Miss I. J., D.Phil., F.S.A., 22 May's Hill Road, Shortlands, Kent.
Churchill, The Right Hon. Winston S., C.H., M.P., Chartwell, Westerham, Kent.
Clapham, J. H., C.B.E., Litt.D., F.B.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Clark, A. E., M.A., 304 Birmingham Road, Walsall.
Clark, C. Upson, Ph.D., City College, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.

Clark, Professor G. N., LL.D., Lit.D., F.B.A., All Souls College, Oxford.
Clark, G. S. R. Kitson, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Clark, Rev. Henry W., D.D., St. John's School, Broxbourne, Herts.
Clarke, Professor F., M.A., 1 Upton Leeze, London Road, S.E.23.
Clay, C. T., M.A., F.S.A., 11 Tite Street, S.W.3.
Clayton, J., Littleworth, Campden, Glos.
Clegg, Mrs., B.A., Branscombe, Avondale Road, Heavitree, Exeter.
Clements, E. E., Greenways, Fairfield Park, Bath.
Cleve, Professor T. C. Van, M.A., Ph.D., Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine, U.S.A.
Coate, Miss M., M.A., Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.
Cobban, A. B. C., M.A., Ph.D., 30 Christchurch Road, N.W.6.
Cockle, M. J. D., Wheatfen Broad, Surlingham, Norwich.
* Code, Rev. Joseph B., M.A., S.T.B., Sc.Hist.D., Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
Colby, Professor C. W., M.A., Ph.D., 1240 Pine Avenue West, Montreal, Canada.
Collingwood, Professor R. G., M.A., F.B.A., F.S.A., 15 Belbroughton Road, Oxford.
Collins, Professor Ross W., M.A., B.D., Ph.D., University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.
Cooper, W., F.S.A., Lulworth Court, Leamington Spa.
Coopland, Professor G. W., M.A., Litt.D., The University, Liverpool.
Cope, J. H., Finchampstead Place, Wokingham, Berks.
* Cornelius, Rev. W. J. J., B.D., D.Litt., The Vicarage, Peacehaven, Sussex.
Corson, J. C., M.A. Ph.D., 2 Wardie Avenue, Edinburgh, 5.
Coupland, Professor R., M.A., Wootton Hill, near Oxford.
* Crawley, C. W., M.A., Trinity Hall, Cambridge.
Cronne, H. A., M.A., 101 Fellows Road, N.W.3.
Cross, Professor A. L., Ph.D., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., U.S.A.
Cruttwell, C. R. M. F., M.A., D.Litt., Hertford College, Oxford.
Cunningham, Miss A., M.A., 2 St. Paul's Road, Cambridge.

Darlington, R. R., B.A., Ph.D., Bedford College, Regent's Park, N.W.1.
* Darwin, F. D. S., M.A., 86A Banbury Road, Oxford.
Das. Harihar, B.Litt., Sidhipasa, Jessore, Khulna, Bengal, India.
David, Professor C. W., Ph.D., Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa., U.S.A.
Davies, Miss A. F., M.A., 8 Belbroughton Road, Oxford.
Davies, C. C., M.A., Ph.D., 100 Divinity Road, Oxford.
* Davies, G., M.A., Huntington Library, San Marino, Cal., U.S.A.
Davies, Rev. R. T., M.A., 9 Manor Road, Holywell, Oxford.
Davies, W. S., M.A., Hartlebury, Overland Road, Mumbles, Swansea.
Davies, W. T., B.A., Glanwern, Clasemont, Morriston, Swansea.
* Davis, Miss E. Jeffries, M.A., F.S.A., University College, Gower Street, W.C.1.
Dawes, M. C. B., B.A., F.S.A., 30 Gainsborough Avenue, St. Albans.
Dawson, Christopher, M.A., Hartlington Hall, Skipton, Yorks.

* Day, P. W., M.A., 2 Rectory Terrace, Gosforth, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Day, W. I. Leeson, 2 Tresilian Gardens, Topsham, Devon.
Deanesly, Miss M., M.A., 197 Clarence Gate Gardens, N.W.1.
Denholm-Young, N., M.A., Magdalen College, Oxford.
Dennett, J., York Lodge, Beverley, E. Yorks.
* Denny, L. R. R., M.A., 28 St. Andrew's Terrace, Strowan, Christchurch, New Zealand.
Dewar, Captain A. C., O.B.E., B.Litt., R.N., Junior Army and Navy Club, Horseguards' Avenue, Whitehall, S.W.1.
Dickie, Professor A. C., M.A., F.S.A., Long Crendon, Bucks.
Dilks, T. B., B.A., East Gate, Bridgwater.
Dodd, Professor A. H., M.A., 12 Menai View Terrace, Upper Bangor.
Dodwell, Professor H. H., M.A., School of Oriental Studies, Vandon House, Vandon Street, S.W.1.
Dorling, Captain H. T., R.N., D.S.O. (retired), 97 Rivermead Court, Hurlingham, S.W.6.
Dormer, E. W., 29 Church Road, Earley, Reading.
Doubleday, H. A., 2 Dungarvan Avenue, S.W.15.
Douglas, Professor D. C., M.A., University College, Exeter.
Douie, Miss D. L., B.A., Ph.D., 13 South Bailey, Durham.
Duchinsky, C., Ph.D., 222 Finchley Road, N.W.3.
Duncalf, Professor F. I., Ph.D., University of Texas, Austin, Texas, U.S.A.
Duncan, Professor D. Shaw, Ph.D., LL.D., 2255 South Columbine Street, Denver, Col., U.S.A.
Dunlop, Mrs., M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt., Dunselma, Fenwick, Ayrshire.
* Durham, The Right Rev. the Bishop of, D.D., F.S.A., Auckland Castle, Bishop Auckland.
Dyer, Miss F. E., 116 Jerningham Road, S.E.14.
Dykes, Professor D. O., K.C., M.A., LL.B., 16 South Charlotte Street, Edinburgh.

Edmond, Miss D., B.Sc., 45 Hepworth Road, S.W.16.
Edwards, J. G., M.A., Jesus College, Oxford.
Edwards, N. F., 147 Queen's Court, Queen's Road, W.2.
Edwards, R. W. D., M.A., Ph.D., 25 Seafield Avenue, Clontarf, Dublin.
Edwards, Major T. J., Room 423, The War Office, Whitehall, S.W.1.
Elliott, C. A., M.A., The Cloisters, Eton College, Windsor.
*Elliott, T. C., A.B., Walla Walla, Washington, U.S.A. (P.O. Box 775).
* Elliott-Binns, Rev. L. E., M.A., D.D., 6 Chaucer Road, Cambridge.
Ellis, A. C., M.A., St. Albans, Chelston, Torquay.
Ellis, C., M.A., 14 Dudley Road, S.W.19.
Ellis, Miss M. F. H., Little Dean, Glos.
Emmison, F. G., 168 Bromham Road, Bedford.
* Ettinger, A. A., M.A., D.Phil., Litt.D., 1011 Highland Avenue, Bethlehem, Pa., U.S.A.
Evans, Miss A. M., M.A., Normal College, Bangor.
Evans, D. L., B.A., B.Litt., Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, W.C.2.
Evans, Miss E., M.A., B.Litt., Somerville College, Oxford.
Evans, Miss Joan, D.Lit., F.S.A., 9 Kensington Park Gardens, W.11.
Evans, Rev. J. H., B.A., Croxton Kerrial Vicarage, Grantham.

Evans, T., M.A., County School, Cardigan.
Evennett, H. O., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
* Ezard, Edward Henry, M.A., M.D., Clare Cottage, Castle Street, Cambridge.

Fagan, Sir Patrick, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., 73 Canfield Gardens, N.W.6.
* Farquhar, Miss Helen, 6 Lowndes Street, S.W.1.
Farran, Professor A. C., M.A., Kharnatak College, Dharwar, India.
* Fawcett, Sir Charles, I.C.S. (retired), c/o Lloyds Bank Ltd., 6 Pall Mall, S.W.1.
* Fay, C. R., M.A., Christ's College, Cambridge.
Fay, Professor S. B., Ph.D., 194 Brattle Street, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Feavearyear, A. E., D.Sc., 48 Cheviot Road, S.E.27.
Fenwick, Miss Susan F., 64 Kensington Park Road, W.11.
Ferris, C. E., Kaikoura, Marlborough, New Zealand.
* Fiddes, Professor E., M.A., LL.D., 173 Wilmslow Road, Withington, Manchester.
* Fletcher, Rev. A. W., M.A., LL.B., Repton Vicarage, Derby.
Fletcher, Rev. Canon J. M. J., M.A., 59 The Close, Salisbury.
Flower, C. T., M.A., F.S.A., 2 Lammas Park Gardens, W.5.
Flower, R. E. W., B.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., 100 Ullswater Road, N.14.
* Ford, Worthington C., M.A., LL.D., Litt.D., 11 bis, rue Henri Cloppet, Le Vésinet, S. et O., France.
Fordham, M. E., M.A., The Severals, Seer Green, Beaconsfield.
Formoy, Mrs. B. E. H., M.A., 12 Middleway, N.W.11.
* Fountaine, Mrs. R. W., Pollicott, Thame, Oxon.
Fowler, G. H., C.B.E., B.A., Ph.D., The Old House, Aspley Guise, Beds.
Frampton, R., B.A., Oaklands, 15 Richmond Hill Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham.
* Freeman, Arnold, M.A., B.Litt., Sheffield Education Settlement, Shipton Street, Sheffield.
* Fryer, Professor C. E., M.A., Ph.D., McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
Furber, H., M.A., Ph.D., E 11 Lowell House, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Fussell, G. E., 3 Primrose House, Albert Terrace, N.W.1.

Galbraith, Professor V. H., M.A., 12 Learmonth Gardens, Edinburgh, 4.
Garrett, Professor H. L. O., M.A., I.E.S., St. John's College, Cambridge.
Garside, B., M.A., Whitecross, Wensleydale Road, Hampton-on-Thames.
Gavin, Mrs. Catherine, M.A., Ph.D., 8 Queen Margaret Road, Glasgow, N.W.1.
Gay, Professor E. F., Ph.D., LL.D., Litt.D., c/o Huntington Library, San Marino, Cal., U.S.A.
Gee, The Very Rev. Henry, D.D., Litt.D., F.S.A., The Deanery, Gloucester.
George, Mrs., M.A., Litt.D., 51 Paulton's Square, S.W.3.
George, R. H., A.M., Ph.D., Brown University, Providence, R.I., U.S.A.
Geyl, Professor Pieter, Litt.D., Willem Barentzstraat 5, Utrecht, Holland.
* Ghatak, Professor Jyotish Chandra, M.A., 4 Boloram Bose Ghat Road, Bhowanipur, Calcutta, India.
Gibson, Strickland, M.A., 34 Hill Top Road, Oxford.

Gill, Professor C., M.A., Litt.D., Chestnut Lodge, Cottingham, E. Yorks.
Gipson, Professor L. H., Ph.D., Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa., U.S.A.
* Giuseppi, M. S., I.S.O., F.S.A. (*Hon. Treasurer*), 72 Burlington Avenue, Kew Gardens, Surrey.
Glendon, E. T., M.A., The Causeway, Burwell, Cambs.
Gnana Viran, S. S., 70 Phayre Street, Rangoon, Burma.
Godley, The Hon. Eveline, Durrant's Court, High Halden, Kent.
Goldthorp, L. M., M.A., Cartmel House, Heckmondwike, Yorks.
* Gooch, G. P., M.A., Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., 76 Campden Hill Road, W.8.
Goodman, Mrs. A. W., Dormy Cottage, 49 S. Cross Road, Winchester.
Goodman, Rev. Canon A. W., M.A., B.D., F.S.A., Dormy Cottage, 49 S. Cross Road, Winchester.
Goodman, Paul, 10 The Ridgeway, N.W.11.
Goodwin, A., M.A., Jesus College, Oxford.
Gotch, J. A., M.A., F.S.A., Weekley Rise, Kettering.
Grace, Miss M., M.A., The Laurels, Newick, Lewes.
Grace, W. F. F., M.A., Ph.D., Thornfield, Huyton, nr. Liverpool.
Graham, G. S., M.A., Ph.D., Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.
* Graham, Miss Rose, M.A., D.Litt., F.S.A., 12 Ladbroke Gardens, W.11.
Graham, Rev. W., M.A., L.Th., 30 Clarendon Square, Leamington Spa.
Grant, Professor A. J., M.A., Litt.D., 17 Gurney Drive, N.2.
Greaves, J. W., M.A., Sydney High School, Moore Park, Sydney, Australia.
Greaves, R. W., M.A., D.Phil., Bedford College, Regent's Park, N.W.1.
Green, D. Walford, M.A., Courtenwell, Langton, near Tunbridge Wells.
Green, H., B.A., St. Michael's, Brands Hill Avenue, High Wycombe, Bucks.
* Greene, C. H., M.A., Incents, Beacon Road, Crowborough, Sussex.
Gregory, M. V., M.A., Dorny, Adamthwaite Drive, Blythe Bridge, Stoke-on-Trent.
Grew, Mrs. M. E., 47 Oakley Street, S.W.3.
Grierson, P., M.A., Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.
Grime, Rev. A., M.A., Ph.D., Lyndhurst, 63 Rawson Street, Farnworth, Bolton.
* Grimes, Rev. C. H. D., M.A., Connaught Club, 75 Seymour Street, W.2.
* Griscom, Rev. Acton, M.A., c/o Hession Maker & Griscom, 52 Broadway, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.
Grose, C. L., Ph.D., 1600 Lincoln Street, Evanston, Ill., U.S.A.
Guedalla, Philip, M.A., 5 Hyde Park Street, W.2.
Guilday, Rev. Monsignor Peter, Ph.D., LL.D., Catholic University of America, Brookland, D.C., U.S.A.
Gumbley, Rev. W., O.P., St. Dominic's Priory, Southampton Road, N.W.3.
* Gun, W. T. J., B.A., 55 Wetherby Mansions, S.W.5.
Gupta, S. N. Das, M.A., Lucknow University, Lucknow, U.P., India.
Gwynn, D. R., B.A., D.Litt., 3 Queen's Terrace, Windsor.

* Hall, C. S., M.A., Heathfield, 3 Queen's Road, Bradford, Yorks.
Hall, D. G. E., M.A., D.Lit., Caterham School, Surrey.
Hall, Hubert, Litt.D., F.S.A. (*Director*) (retired 31 Oct. 1938), Cartref, Walderslade, near Chatham.

Hall, I. V., M.A., 148 Fishponds Road, Bristol.
* Hall, T. W., M.A., F.S.A., 6 Gladstone Road, Sheffield.
Halliday, W. R., M.A., LL.D., King's College, Strand, W.C.2.
Hampson, Miss E. M., M.A., Ph.D., Newnham College, Cambridge.
Hancock, The Ven. Archdeacon L. R., M.A., The Rectory, Whatley, Frome, Som.
Hancock, Professor W. K., M.A., The University, Edmund Street, Birmingham.
Hannay, Professor R. K., M.A., LL.D., 5 Royal Terrace, Edinburgh.
Harding, W. G., F.S.A., Peckwater House, Charing, Kent.
Harley, J. H., M.A., 59 Parliament Hill, N.W.3.
Harlow, Professor V. T., M.A., D.Litt., 1 Brick Court, Temple, E.C.4.
* Harris, Sir Charles A., K.C.M.G., C.B., C.V.O., Greenhill Brow, Farnham, Surrey.
Harvey, Professor E. L., M.A., c/o Thos. Cook & Son, Hong-Kong, China.
Hasluck, E. L., B.A., Heathfield, Western Avenue, Herne Bay.
Hattersley, Professor A. F., M.A., 10 The Avenue, Filey, Yorks.
* Havinden, Eric, M.A., 30 Park Avenue, Solihull, Warwickshire.
Hayden, Professor Mary T., M.A., 26 Cambridge Road, Upper Rathmines, Dublin.
Hazeltine, Professor H. D., M.A., F.B.A., West Lodge, Downing College, Cambridge.
Hazen, Professor C. D., Ph.D., Columbia University, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.
* Hearnshaw, Professor F. J. C., M.A., LL.D., Litt.D., Hammerwood, Oxted, Surrey.
Heathcote, C. W., A.M., Ph.D., State Normal School, 215 South Walnut Street, West Chester, Pa., U.S.A.
Heatley, D. P., M.A., 28 Minto Street, Edinburgh.
Heaton, Professor H., M.A., D.Litt., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., U.S.A.
Hedworth-Whitty, R. G., M.A., Ph.D., Thone, Staplegrove Road, Taunton, Som.
Hemmant, Miss M., B.A., Ph.D., The Lodge, Sevenoaks.
Henderson, Professor G. D., D.D., D.Litt., The University, Aberdeen.
Henderson, J. M., M.A., King's College, Aberdeen.
Hepburn, E., 111 Main Road, Sidcup, Kent.
* Higham, C. S. S., M.A., 16 Leopold Road, S.W.19.
Hill, J. W. F., M.A., LL.M., 2 Lindum Terrace, Lincoln.
Hill, Lady, Green Place, Stockbridge, Hants.
Hine, R. L., F.S.A., Willian Bury, Willian, Herts.
Hoare, H. P. R., B.A., 37 Fleet Street, E.C.4.
Hodges, H. W., M.A., Royal Naval College, Dartmouth.
* Hodgkin, R. H., M.A., The Queen's College, Oxford.
Hoggarth, A. H. G., M.A., Churcher's College, Petersfield.
* Hollingsworth, L. W., B.A., Education Dept., Zanzibar, E. Africa.
Holt, Miss A. D., 54 Ullett Road, Liverpool, 17.
Hood, Mrs. Ivo, Sidestrand, Cromer.
* Horn, D. B., M.A., D.Litt., Ettrick, Pentland Avenue, Colinton, Edinburgh.
Horne, Rev. W., The Vicarage, Lower Darwen, Lancs.

Horváth, Professor Eugene, Phil.D., II, Ilona útca 4, Francis Joseph Institute, Budapest, Hungary.
Hoskins, H. L., Ph.D., Tufts College, Medford, Mass., U.S.A.
Hoult, James, F.S.A.(Scot.), 12 Brookland Road, Stoneycroft, Liverpool.
Houseman, J. W., M.A., The Grammar School, Hipperholme, Yorks.
* Howard-Watson, Captain J. A., F.R.G.S., F.R.S.L., Bella Vista, Nicholas Road, Blundellsands, near Liverpool.
Howay, His Honour F. W., LL.D., Law Courts, New Westminster, British Columbia, Canada.
Howden, Miss M. P., M.A., 17c Huskisson Street, Liverpool.
Hoyland, J. S., M.A., Holland House, Woodbrooke, Selly Oak, Birmingham.
Hudson, G. F., M.A., All Souls College, Oxford.
Hull, Professor W. I., Ph.D., Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., U.S.A.
Hulme, H., Ph.D., New York University, Washington Square East, New York City, U.S.A.
Humphreys, R. A., M.A., Ph.D., University College, Gower Street, W.C.1.
Hunt, R. N. Carew, B.A., B.Litt., 3c Carlisle Place, S.W.1.
Hurnard, Miss N. D., M.A., D.Phil., 49 Woodstock Road, Oxford.
* Hyamson, A. M., 32 Teignmouth Road, N.W.2.
Hyde, F. E., M.A., Ph.D., The University, Liverpool.
Hyde, H. M., M.A., 32 Roland Gardens, S.W.7.
* Hyde, J. H., B.A., 18 rue Adolphe Yvon, Paris, XVI^e, France.
Hyslop, R., F.S.A. (Scot.), Field House, Hylton, Sunderland.

* Ilchester, The Right Hon. the Earl of, Holland House, Kensington, W.8.
Irwin, Miss M. G., M.A., 7 The Butts, Harrow-on-the-Hill.
Ivamy, E., M.A., Redesdale, The Park, Cheltenham.

Jackson, Rev. Canon F. J. Foakes, D.D., Union Theological Seminary, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.
Jackson, H. S., 165 New Park Road, S.W.2.
* Jackson, Mrs. Nevill, 55 Bedford Gardens, W.8.
Jacob, Professor E. F., M.A., D.Phil., F.S.A., The Victoria University, Manchester.
James, Miss M., M.A., 5 Arboretum Street, Nottingham.
Jamison, Miss E. M., M.A., 16a The Boltons, S.W.10.
Jenkins, R. T., M.A., Rhuddallt, Menai Road, Bangor.
Jenkins, Rev. Canon Claude, D.D., F.S.A., Christ Church, Oxford.
Jenkinson, Hilary, M.A., F.S.A., Arun House, Horsham, Sussex.
Jessop, J. C., M.A., Ph.D., Beacon Hill, Lossiemouth, Scotland.
* Johnson, C., M.A., F.B.A., F.S.A., 13a Downshire Hill, N.W.3.
Johnson, J. D. A., LL.D., F.R.S.A. (Irel.), 5 Elton Park, Kingstown, Co. Dublin.
Johnson J. H., M.A., Whitehorns, Cedar Avenue, Chelmsford.
Johnston, D. Hope, M.A., J.P., 1a Regent's Court, Park Road, N.W.1.
Johnston, Rev. J. B., M.A., B.D., 63 Cluny Gardens, Edinburgh, 10.
Johnstone, Professor Hilda, M.A., Holly Cottage, Englefield Green, Surrey.
Johnstone, The Ven. Archdeacon S. M., M.A., F.S.A.(Scot.), Bishopscourt, Edgecliff, New South Wales, Australia.

Jolliffe, J. E. A., M.A., Keble College, Oxford.
Jones, A. E., M.A., 6 Primrose Drive, Gilstead, Bingley.
Jones, E. Alfred, M.A., F.S.A., Royal Societies Club, St. James's Street, S.W.1
Jones, Rev. G. Hartwell, D.D., D.Litt., Nutfield Rectory, Redhill, Surrey.
* Jones, G. P., M.A., 109 Ashdell Road, Sheffield, 10.
* Jones, Miss M. E. Monckton, M.A., Green Shade, Crowthorne, Berks.
Jones, Professor T. F., Ph.D., New York University, University Heights, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.
Jordan, W. K., A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Scripps College, Claremont, Cal., U.S.A.
Joüon des Longrais, Professor F., D.-en-droit, L.-ès-L., 4 rue de la Terrasse, Paris XVII, France.
Judges, A. V., B.A. (*Literary Director*), London School of Economics, Houghton Street, Aldwych, W.C.2.

* Kay, H., M.A., Rivington, Palmerston Road, Buckhurst Hill, Essex.
Keenleyside, H. Ll., M.A., Ph.D., Department of External Affairs, Ottawa, Canada.
Kelly, Rev. B. W., Corpus Christi House, 12 Trent Road, S.W.2.
Kelway, Clifton, F.R.G.S., St. Peter's Vicarage, Varna Road, S.W.6.
Kennedy, W. J. Rann, M.A., Hughenden Cottage, Hughenden, High Wycombe, Bucks.
Kenney, James F., M.A., Ph.D., The Public Archives, Ottawa, Canada.
Kerr, W. B., M.A., Ph.D., University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y., U.S.A.
Ketelbey, Miss D. M., M.A., 5 St. Mary's Place, St. Andrew's, Fife.
*Khan, Sir Shafaat Ahmad, Litt.D., The University, Allahabad, India.
Khanna, Kahan Chand, M.A., Ph.D., Multan, Punjab, India.
King, Colonel E. J., C.M.G., M.A., D.L., The Old House, East Finchley, N.2.
Kingham, W. R., M.A., Icknield, Pitstone Green, near Leighton Buzzard.
Kinloch, Rev. T. F., M.A., Morville Hall, Bridgnorth, Shropshire.
Kirkconnell, Professor Watson, M.A., F.R.G.S., Wesley College, Winnipeg, Canada.
* Kirkpatrick, F. A., M.A., 2 Thurloe Court, S.W.3.
Kitchener, E. E., M.A., 34 Coombe Road, Croydon, Surrey.
Klingberg, Professor F. J., A.B., A.M., Ph.D., 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, Cal., U.S.A.
Knappen, M. M., Faculty Exchange, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.
Knight, L. Stanley, M.A., The School House, Pengam, Glam.
Krishnamachasi, T. M., H.H., The Maharajah's College, Trivandrum, Travancore, S. India.
Krishnamurti, N. A., Tirumalai Lodge, Trivandrum, Travancore, S. India.
* Krofta, Professor Kamil, Dr. Phil., The University, Prague, Czecho-Slovakia.

Laistner, Professor M. L. W., M.A., 4 Boardman Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.
La Monte, J. L., Ph.D., University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A.
Lanctot, G., Litt.D., The Public Archives, Ottawa, Canada.

Landon, L., 67 St. George's Square, S.W.1.
* Langley, Rev. A. S., The Manse, Walsall Street, Wednesbury.
Langstone, Miss R. W., M.A., 30 Corser Street, Stourbridge.
Langton, Rev. E., B.D., The Manse, Kirkby Stephen, near Penrith.
Laprade, Professor W. T., Ph.D., 1108 Monmouth Avenue, Durham, N. Carolina, U.S.A.
Lapsley, G., M.A., Ph.D., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Law, Miss A., 135 Queen's Road, Blackburn.
Lees, Miss B. A., M.A., 8 Norham Road, Oxford.
Leftwich, B. R., M.B.E., 1 The Avenue, Barnet.
Lega-Weekes, Miss Ethel, Varnello, Topsham Road, Exeter.
Legg, L. G. Wickham, M.A., Foxcombe Rise, Boar's Hill, Oxford.
Lenanton, Mrs. C. M. A., Bride Hall, Ayot St. Lawrence, Welwyn, Herts.
* Lennard, R. V., M.A., Wadham College, Oxford.
* Leonard, Miss E. M., M.A., 13 Oakwood Court, W.14.
Le Patourel, J. H., M.A., D.Phil., Kyrton, Fosse André, Guernsey, Channel Islands.
* Lepper, R. S., LL.M., Elsinore, Crawfordsburn, Co. Down.
Letts, Malcolm, F.S.A., 27 West Heath Drive, N.W.11.
Lewis, Professor E. A., M.A., D.Sc., University College of Wales, Aberystwyth.
Lewis, Frank R., M.A., D.Phil., Gorphwysfa, Aberystwyth.
Lewis, Professor M. A., M.A., Royal Naval College, Greenwich, S.E.10.
Lewis, N. B., M.A., Ph.D., 40 Westbourne Road, Sheffield, 10.
Lewis, T. H., M.A., 79 Heath Park Avenue, Cardiff.
Leys, Mrs. R. A., M.A., B.Litt., The Cedars, Martock, Som.
Leys, Mrs. K. K. M., M.A., St. Hilda's College, Oxford.
Liddell-Hart, Captain B. H., 123 Gloucester Place, W.1.
* Lipson, E., M.A., New College, Oxford.
Little, Andrew G., M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., Risborough, Vine Court Road, Sevenoaks.
* Littler, Rev. H. D., M.A., Red Barns, Redcar.
Lloyd, H. I., O.B.E., M.A., Civil Court, Basrah, Iraq.
* Lloyd, Professor Sir John E., M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A., Gwaen Deg, Bangor.
Lock, Arthur B., Dulwich Road School, Kingstanding, Birmingham.
Lockitt, C. H., M.A., Easedown, Kingstouridge, Lewes.
* Longden, Rev. H. I., M.A., F.S.A., Heyford Rectory, Northampton.
Loomis, Professor Louise, Ph.D., Wells College, Aurora-on-Cayuga, New York, U.S.A.
Lovegrove, E. W., M.A., F.S.A., St. David's, Chipping Campden, Glos.
* Loyd, L. C., B.A., 25 Moore Street, S.W.3.
Lumb, Miss S. V., M.A., 364 Great Clowes Street, Higher Broughton, Salford, 7.
Lunt, Professor W. E., Ph.D., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., U.S.A.
* Lybyer, Professor A. H., A.M., Ph.D., 1006 West Nevada Street, Urbana, Ill., U.S.A.
* Lydall, John French, M.A., LL.D., 37 John Street, Bedford Row, W.C.1.
Lydekker, J. W., M.A., 20 Nevern Mansions, S.W.5.
Lyell, James P. R., J.P., B.Litt., The Knowl, Abingdon, Berks.

Macalister, Professor R. A. S., Litt.D., F.S.A., 18 Mount Eden Road, Dublin, S.W.1.
Macartney, C. A., M.A., All Souls College, Oxford.
* McClellan, Professor George B., M.A., LL.D., 2424 California Street, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
McCoy, C., Eagle Dell, Ware Road, Hailey, Hertford.
McElroy, Professor R., M.A., LL.D., Ph.D., 78 Banbury Road, Oxford.
McFarlane, K. B., M.A., Magdalen College, Oxford.
McHaffie, W. H., M.A., Bow Central School, Coborn Street, E.3.
McIlwain, Professor C. H., Ph.D., LL.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
McKay, D. C., A.B., M.A., Ph.D., 232 Prospect Street, Belmont, Mass., U.S.A.
Mackie, Professor J. D., M.A., 9 The University, Glasgow, W.2.
McKisack, Miss May, M.A., B.Litt., Somerville College, Oxford.
McLachlan, Rev. H., M.A., D.D., Summerville, Victoria Park, Manchester.
McLaughlin, Professor A. C., A.M., LL.D., 5609 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.
MacLaughlin, M. C., M.A., Overton Lea, Cheltenham.
McLennan, Senator J. S., The Senate, Ottawa, Canada.
McMaster, Mrs. Ian, M.A., Eton College, Windsor.
McNamara, W. H., 29 Campbell Road, E.17.
McNulty, Rev. J., B.A., 122 Anfield Road, Liverpool, 4.
Magrath, C. J., O.B.E., D.Litt., 173 Rustlings Road, Sheffield.
Mainwaring, J., M.A., Lingwood, St. James' Road, Dudley.
Major, Miss E. H., C.B.E., M.A., LL.D., 1A Camp View, S.W.19.
Major, Miss K., B.A., B.Litt., 21 Queen's Way, Lincoln.
* Malden, Rev. E. E., M.A., M.B.E., The Vicarage, Amberley, North Canterbury, New Zealand.
Malden, The Very Rev. R. H., M.A., B.D., The Deanery, Wells.
Manning, B. L., M.A., Jesus College, Cambridge.
Manwaring, G. E., Silverwood, 117 Burdon Lane, Belmont, Surrey.
Marsh, Professor F. B., Ph.D., University of Texas, Austin, Texas, U.S.A.
Marshall, Miss D., M.A., Mill House, Bethersden, Kent.
Marshall, Professor R. L., M.A., LL.D., 1 College Avenue, Magee College, Londonderry.
* Marten, C. H. K., M.A., Waynflete House, Eton College, Windsor.
Martin, Miss E. C., M.A., Ph.D., Westfield College, Hampstead, N.W.3.
Martin, Thomas P., A.B., A.M., Ph.D., MSS. Dept., Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
Marvin, F. S., M.A., H.M.I., Pantiles, Welwyn Garden City, Herts.
* Mason, Rev. W. A. Parker, M.A., Ardleigh Vicarage, Colchester.
Mathew, Rev. A. G., M.A., Blackfriars, Oxford.
* Mathew, Rev. D. J., M.A., Litt.D., F.S.A., 1 Woburn Square, W.C.1.
Mathews, G. W., F.S.A., 11 Ennerdale Road, Wallasey, Cheshire.
* Mathur, Tikait Narain, B.A., LL.B., 30/27 Chili-ent Road, Agra, U.P., India.
Matthews, A. G., M.A., Farncote, Oxted, Surrey.
Mears, R. A. F., M.A., B.Litt., 12 Polstead Road, Oxford.
Medley, Professor D. J., M.A., Ashby, Tydehams, Newbury, Berks.
Medlicott, W. N., M.A., University College, Swansea.

Mellows, W. T., LL.B., The Vineyard, Vineyard Road, Peterborough.
Merriman, Professor Roger B., M.A., Master's Lodgings, Eliot House, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Methley, Miss Violet M., 131 Sunny Gardens Road, N.W.4.
Miller, W., M.A., F.B.A., British Archæological School, Rue Spensiopos, Athens, Greece.
Milne, A. T., M.A., 14 Allison Grove, S.E.21.
Montgomery, Mrs. I. A., M.A., Ph.D., 18 Northumberland Street, Edinburgh.
Moody, T. W., B.A., Ph.D., Queen's University, Belfast.
* Moor, Rev. Charles, M.A., D.D., F.S.A., 50 Harrington Gardens, S.W.7.
Moore, H. Stuart, F.S.A., 6 King's Bench Walk, Temple, E.C.4.
Moore, Miss M. F., M.A., Ph.D., 135 Mayfield Road, Edinburgh, 9.
* Moorman, Mrs., B.A., 6 Church Square, Leighton Buzzard.
Moreton, Rev. Canon H. A. V., B.A., D. ès Lettres (Besançon), The Close, Hereford.
* Morgan, Professor W. T., M.A., Ph.D., Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., U.S.A.
* Morison, Professor J. L., M.A., D.Litt., Fellside, Corbridge, Northumberland.
Morley, T. H., B.Sc., 312 King's Road, Reading.
Morrah, D. M. M., M.A., 33 Bedford Place, W.C.1.
Morrell, W. P., M.A., D.Phil., 4 Alma Terrace, W.8.
Morris, Ernest, 24 Coventry Street, Leicester.
* Morris, Rev. Professor H. C. S., M.A., 28 The Close, Salisbury.
Morris, Professor W. A., Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley, Cal., U.S.A.
Mounfield, A., 34 Walton Road, Warrington.
* Muller, Professor J. A., Ph.D., 4 St. John's Road, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Mumby, F. A., 135 Foxley Lane, Purley, Surrey.
Murray, Miss K. M. E., B.A., B.Litt., Upper Cranmore, Heyshott, Midhurst, Sussex.
Myres, J. N. L., M.A., Christ Church, Oxford.
Myres, Rev. M. W., D.D., Frodsham Vicarage, nr. Warrington.

Namier, Professor L. B., M.A., The Victoria University, Manchester.
Narayan, Brij., M.A., c/o Allahabad Bank, Ltd., Delhi, India.
* Nathan, Lt.-Col. The Right Hon. Sir Matthew, G.C.M.G., LL.D., The Manor House, West Coker, Yeovil.
* Neale, Professor J. E., M.A., University College, Gower Street, W.C.1.
Neale, Lieut.-Colonel, R. H. R., Redfern, Ash Vale, Surrey.
Nef, Professor J. U., Ph.D., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.
Neilson, Professor N., Ph.D., Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass., U.S.A.
New, Professor C. W., B.A., Ph.D., McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.
Newhall, Professor R. A., Ph.D., Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., U.S.A.
Newton, Professor A. P., M.A., D.Lit., F.S.A., 44 Meadway Court, N.W.11.
Nichols, J. F., M.C., M.A., Ph.D., F.S.A., 105 College Road, Isleworth, Middlesex.

* Nicholson, T. C., M.A., Strathmore, Wath-upon-Dearne, nr. Rotherham.
Nijhoff, Wouter, Lange Voorhout 9, The Hague, Holland.
Noakes, Miss J., Little Lindens, Linden Path, Leatherhead.
Nobbs, D., M.A., 51 Craiglockhart Avenue, Edinburgh, 11.
* Nunn, William, Gillgrass, Gosforth, Cumberland.

Oakley, T. P., Ph.D., 522 West 122nd Street, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.
O'Brien, Rev. E. M., M.A., Ph.D., St. Felix's Presbytery, Chapel Road, Bankstown, Sydney, Australia.
O'Connell, Rev. Sir John R., M.A., LL.D., Artillery Mansions, 75 Victoria Street, S.W.1.
Offer, Rev. C. J., M.A., Highmore Vicarage, Henley, Oxon.
* Oke, A. W., B.A., LL.M., F.S.A., 32 Denmark Villas, Hove, Sussex.
Oman, Professor Sir Charles, D.C.L., LL.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Frewin Hall, Oxford.
Onslow, The Right Hon. the Earl of, G.B.E., M.A., Clandon Park, Guildford.
* Osborn, J. Lee, Bevis, Liddington, near Swindon.
O'Sullivan, Professor Mary J. Donovan, M.A., Lisgorm, Galway, Ireland.
Owen, C. V., Committee of Imperial Defence (*Historical Section*), Dorland House, 18/20 Lower Regent Street, S.W.1.
* Owen, Commander J. H. (retired), Broadwater House, Stevenage, Herts.
Owen, Professor L. V. D., M.A., University College, Nottingham.
* Owen, R., Argraffdy Owen, Welshpool.
Owst, Professor G. R., Litt.D., D.Lit., Ph.D., Gresham House, Cambridge.

Packard, Professor S. R., Ph.D., 85 Washington Avenue, Northampton, Mass., U.S.A.
Page, Miss Frances M., M.A., Ph.D., 33 Billing Road, Northampton.
Page, M. E., Fore Street, Bridgwater.
* Paget, Major T. G. F., J.P., D.L., Sulby Hall, Welford, Rugby.
Paik, Professor L. G., M.A., Ph.D., Park College, Parkville, Miss., U.S.A.
Pakeman, Professor S. A., M.C., M.A., University College, Colombo, Ceylon.
Pantin, W. A., M.A., F.S.A., Oriel College, Oxford.
Pares, R., M.A., All Souls College, Oxford.
Parker, Captain H., F.R.G.S., 2 Albemarle Street, W.1.
Parker, H. M. D., M.A., Magdalen College, Oxford.
* Parker, L. N., F.R.A.M., 12 Harley Gardens, S.W.10.
* Parkinson, C. N., M.A., Ph.D., Emmanuel College, Cambridge.
Parsloe, C. G., B.A., 19 Sispara Gardens, S.W.18.
Passfield, The Right Hon. Lord, LL.B., Passfield Corner, Liphook, Hants.
Pearce, J. P., F.R.I.B.A., Lloyds Bank Buildings, 66 Bold Street, Liverpool, 1.
Pearn, B. R., M.A., University College, Rangoon, Burma.
* Pearson, Rev. A. F. Scott, D.Th., D.Litt., The Manse, Johnstone, Renfrewshire.
Peel, Rev. Albert, M.A., Litt.D., 97 Russell Road, Buckhurst Hill.
Peel, J. K., M.A., 6 Canterbury Terrace, Leicester.
Penn, C. D., M.A., 25 Henderson Road, S.W.18.

Penson, Professor Lillian M., Ph.D., 69 Wellington Court, Wellington Road, N.W.8.
Perkins, Rev. Canon J. H. T., M.A., D.C.L., F.S.A., 5 Little Cloisters, Westminster Abbey, S.W.1.
Perroy, E. M. J., D.-ès-L., 38 rue du Molinel, Lille, Nord, France.
Petrie, Sir Charles, Bt., M.A., 14 Tregunter Road, The Boltons, S.W.10.
Peyton, S. A., Ph.D., 20 London Road, Reading.
* Phelps, Rev. P. B., M.A., Swanmore, near Bishop's Waltham, Hants.
Pickthorn, K. W. M., M.A., M.P., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.
Pieris, P. E., C.M.G., Litt.D., The Priory, Colombo, Ceylon.
Plucknett, Professor T. F. T., M.A., LL.B., 17 Crescent Road, S.W.20.
Plunket, Miss Ierne A. L., M.A., Crosby Hall, Cheyne Walk, S.W.10.
* Pollard, A. F., D.Litt., D.Lit., Litt.D., F.B.A., Brierfield, Milford-on-Sea, Hants.
Pond, P. J., Springfield House, Chalford, Stroud, Glos.
Poole, A. L., M.A., St. John's College, Oxford.
Porteus, Rev. T. C., M.A., B.D., St. George's Vicarage, Chorley, Lancs.
Postan, Professor M., M.Sc., Peterhouse, Cambridge.
* Potter, Professor G. R., M.A., Ph.D., The University, Sheffield.
Potter, H., Ph.D., LL.B., King's College, Strand, W.C.2.
Powell, Miss D. L., B.A., 51 Elm Park Mansions, Park Walk, S.W.10.
* Powell, Miss Helen L., 127 Vassall Road, S.W.9.
Powell, Miss I. G., M.A., Royal Holloway College, Englefield Green, Surrey.
Powell-Price, J. C., M.A., I.E.S., Allahabad, United Provinces, India.
Power, C. E., 24 Howard Road, New Malden, Surrey.
Power, Professor Eileen E., M.A., D.Lit., Litt.D., 20 Mecklenburgh Square, W.C.1.
Powicke, Professor F. M., M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A., Oriel College, Oxford.
Powley, E. B., B.A., B.Litt., 6 Partridge Road, Blundellsands, Liverpool, 23.
Pratt, Rev. M. A. R., 5 Epworth Chambers, P.O. Box, 931, Christchurch, New Zealand.
Prestage, Professor Edgar, M.A., D.Litt., 16 Holland Street, W.8.
Preston, A. E., F.S.A., Whitefield, Abingdon.
* Previté-Orton, Professor C. W., M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A., 55 Bateman Street, Cambridge.
Proby, Granville, M.A., F.S.A., Elton Hall, Peterborough.
Procter, Miss Evelyn E. S., M.A., St. Hugh's College, Oxford.
Pryce, A. I., M.A., Diocesan Registry, Bangor.
Purvis, A., B.Sc., 6 Greenhalgh Walk, N.2.
Purvis, Rev. J. S., M.A., Cranleigh School, near Guildford.
Putnam, Professor Bertha H., Ph.D., Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass., U.S.A.
Pybus, Miss H. J., M.A., Newnham College, Cambridge.

Raby, F. J. E., C.B., M.A., F.S.A., Southways, Douglas Road, Harpenden, Herts.
Radford, C. A. R., B.A., Bradninch Manor, Devon.
Radice, Mrs. Charles, Coombe House, Coombe, near Oxford.
Rae, D., M.A., Teachers' Training College, Epsom, Auckland, S.E.13, New Zealand.

Ragatz, Professor L. J., M.A., Ph.D., The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
Ramsey, R. W., F.S.A., 43 Ladbroke Square, W.11.
Ravenshaw, J., B.A., 10 West Hill, N.6.
Rawlinson, H. G., M.A., c/o Thos. Cook & Son, Berkeley Street, W.1.
Ray, J. E., 9 Stanley Road, Hastings.
Read, Conyers, Ph.D., Villa Nova, Pa., U.S.A.
* Realey, C. B., Ph.D., University Club, 1435 Ohio Street, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.
Reaney, P. H., M.A., Ph.D., 12 Howard Road, Walthamstow, Essex.
Reddaway, T. F., M.A., 2 Buckingham Road, Cambridge.
* Reddaway, W. F., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Redlich, Rev. Canon E. B., M.A., B.D., Little Bowden Rectory, Market Harborough.
Redstone, V. B., F.S.A., 3 Seckford Street, Woodbridge.
Rees, Rev. T. Mardy, 24 Rugby Avenue, Neath, S. Wales.
Rees, Professor W., M.A., D.Sc., University College, Cathay's Park, Cardiff.
Reid, Miss R. R., M.A., D.Lit., 40 Cholmley Gardens, N.W.6.
* Renaut, Professor F. P., LL.D., D.Litt., 38 rue du Lourmel, Paris, XV^e, France.
Renier, G. J., Ph.D., 9 Grafton Mansions, Duke's Road, W.C.1.
Rich, E. E., M.A., St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.
Richardson, H. G., M.A., B.Sc., High Barn, 14 Sheridan Road, S.W.19.
Richardson, Mrs. Herbert, B.A., 48 Junction Road, Andover.
Richardson, Professor R. K., Ph.D., Beloit College, Beloit, Wis., U.S.A.
Richmond, Admiral Sir H. W., K.C.B., M.A., F.B.A., Downing College, Cambridge.
Riddell, The Hon. Mr. Justice W. Renwick, B.Sc., LL.D., Hon. L.H.D., Osgoode Hall, Toronto, Canada.
Riker, Professor T. W., B.Litt., 2300 Leon Street, Austin, Texas, U.S.A.
Rimmer, Rev. J. S., M.A., B.D., The Rectory, Ulverston.
* Roberts, Captain J. H., F.S.I., 61 Wind Street, Swansea.
Roberts, P. E., M.A., Worcester College, Oxford.
* Roberts, R. A., Smithy Cottage, Orford, Woodbridge.
Robertson, Sir C. Grant, C.V.O., M.A., All Souls College, Oxford.
Robertson, L. A., M.A., B.Litt., 310 Ferry Road, Edinburgh, 5.
Robinson, Professor Chalfant, Ph.D., Princeton University, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.
Robinson, Professor E. E., Ph.D., Stanford University, Cal., U.S.A.
Robinson, Miss E. M., Moylena, 80 Underhill Road, S.E.22.
Robinson, Professor Howard, M.A., Ph.D., LD.D., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, U.S.A.
* Robinson, Morgan P., M.A., LL.B., 113 S. 3rd Street, Richmond, Va., U.S.A.
*Rodkey, F. S., A.M., Ph.D., 325 Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Ill., U.S.A.
Roe, F. Gordon, Kingston Lodge, 24 Addison Road, W.14.
Rogers, Rev. Patrick C. J., M.A., D.Litt., St. Malachy's Diocesan College, Belfast.
Ronan, Rev. M. V., 6 Eblana Avenue, Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin.
Rose-Troup, Mrs. Frances, Upauver, Crediton, Devon.

Roth, Cecil, M.A., B.Litt., D.Phil., 65 Compayne Gardens, N.W.6.
Rothwell, H., B.A., Ph.D., The University, Edinburgh.
* Routh, Miss E. M. G., Fairpark House, Exeter.
Routledge, F. J., M.A., B.Litt., 19 Banks Avenue, Great Meols, Wirral, Cheshire.
Rowe, Miss B. J. H., M.A., B.Litt., c/o National Provincial Bank, The Square, Bournemouth.
Ruiz-Guiñazũ, Enrique, Légation Argentine, 13 Avenue de Champel, Geneva, Switzerland.
Runciman, J. C. S., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Russell, Ephraim, M.A., B.Sc., Newlands, Swanlon, Winsford, Cheshire.
Russell, J. C., Ph.D., 422 Cameron Avenue, Chapel Hill, N.C., U.S.A.
Rutherford, Professor J., M.A., Ph.D., University College, Auckland, New Zealand.
Ruud, M. B., Ph.D., 429 Walnut Street, S.E., Minneapolis, Minn., U.S.A.

Sadler, H. W. W., Grammar School, Uxbridge Road, Hayes, Middlesex.
Sage, Professor W. N., M.A., Ph.D., University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
Sainsbury, Miss E. B., M.B.E., 29 Abercorn Place, N.W.8.
* Salter, F. R., M.A., Magdalene College, Cambridge.
Saltmarsh, J., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
* Samuel, W. S., F.S.A., 102 Cheapside, E.C.2.
Sanigar, W. T., 205 Avon Vale Road, Barton Hill, Bristol.
Sastri, K. N. V., M.A., Ph.D., H.H. Maharajah's College, Mysore, India.
Saunders, H. W., M.A., D.Litt., The Firs, Cowley, near Uxbridge, Middx.
Sayles, G. O., M.A., D.Litt., The University, Glasgow.
Schofield, B., M.A., Ph.D., British Museum, W.C.1.
Scholefield, G. H., O.B.E., D.Sc., 42 Upper Watt Street, Highland Park, Wellington, New Zealand.
Schuyler, Professor R. L., A.M., Ph.D., Columbia University, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.
* Scofield, Miss Cora L., Ph.D., The College Club, 40 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
Scott, Professor Ernest, M.A., Illenden, Vermont, Victoria, Australia.
Scott, Rev. H. S., D.Phil., B.Litt., Oddington Rectory, Islip, Oxon.
Searley, A. W., Northernhay, Kingskerswell, Devon.
Sears, Professor L. M., Ph.D., Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, U.S.A.
* Seebohm, Hugh Exton, J.P., Poynders End, Hitchin.
Sefton-Jones, Mrs. H. M., Hampton Court Palace, Hampton Court, Middlesex.
Sen, Surendra Nath, M.A., Ph.D., B.Litt., 6/3 Ekdalia Road, Ballygunge, Calcutta, India.
Seth, Mesrovb J., 9 Marsden Street, Calcutta, India.
Seton-Watson, Professor R. W., D.Litt., Ph.D., F.B.A., 1 Parkside Gardens, S.W.19.
* Seybolt, Professor R. F., M.A., Ph.D., University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., U.S.A.
Seymour, President C., LL.D., Litt.D., 43 Hillhouse Avenue, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.

* Shaw, Professor P. E., M.A., Ph.D., Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn., U.S.A.
Shaw, W. B., F.S.A.(Scot.), 56 Sandy Lane, Stretford, near Manchester.
* Shawcross, Major G. N., R.E. (T.A.), M.B.E., Deanwood, Rivington, nr. Bolton.
Shelley, R. J. A., Denbie House, Formby, Lancs.
Shelley-Rolls, Sir J. C. E., Bt., Avington Park, Winchester.
Sherwani, Professor H. K., M.A., Rahat Fiza, Himayalnagar, Hyderabad, Deccan, India.
* Shettle, Rev. G. T., L.A., Hunsingore House, Wetherby, Yorks.
* Shipman, H. R., Ph.D., 27 Mercer Street, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.
Shirley, Rev. F. J., M.A., LL.B., Precincts 15, Canterbury.
Siebert, Professor W. H., M.A., University Hall, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, U.S.A.
* Sieveking, A. Forbes, F.S.A., 7 Belsize Grove, N.W.3.
Sikes, J. G., M.A., Newnham Grove, Cambridge.
* Simpson, Rev. F. A., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Skipton, Rev. H. P. K., F.S.A., St. Philip's Parsonage, Reigate.
Slosser, Rev. Professor G. J., S.T.M., Ph.D., 203 Summit Avenue, Bellevue, Pittsburg, Pa., U.S.A.
Smart, Lieut.-Colonel F. W. B., M.A., Rathmoyle, Hurtmore, Godalming.
Smith, Donald, F.R.G.S., Park Senior School, Vicarage Road, Dagenham, Essex.
Smith, D. B., The Library, Admiralty, S.W.1.
* Smith, Miss M. Howes, M.A., 2 Sunny Bank, Stamford Road, Bowdon, Cheshire.
Smith, W. Owston, M.A., I.E.S., 41 Molyneux Park, Tunbridge Wells.
* Smyth, Rev. C. H. E., M.A., 186 Huntingdon Road, Cambridge.
Soltau, Professor R. H., M.A., American University, Beirut, Syria.
Somers, Rev. H. J., J.C.B., M.A., Ph.D., St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Nova Scotia.
Southam, Colonel L. A. C., D.S.O., Rodney House, Malvern Link.
Southern, R. W., B.A., Exeter College, Oxford.
Spencer, T. P., M.A., County Secondary School, Heanor, Nottingham.
Spens, H. B., B.A., 25 Park Circus, Glasgow.
Stafford, G. W., M.A., Moorbeck, Lightwood Road, Buxton.
* Stampa, L., M.A., F.S.A., Stanton, Higher Erith Road, Torquay.
Standing, T. G., M.A., Prince Edward School, Salisbury, S. Rhodesia, South Africa.
Stanley, G. F. G., M.A., B.Litt., D.Phil., Mount Allison University, Sackville, N.B., Canada.
Steed, Wickham, LL.D., 7 Lansdowne House, Holland Park, W.11.
Steefel, L. D., M.A., Ph.D., 735 Huron Street, S.E., Minneapolis, Minn., U.S.A.
Steel, A. B., M.A., Christ's College, Cambridge.
* Stenton, Mrs. F. M., B.A., Whitley Park Farm, Reading.
Stenton, Professor F. M. (*President*), M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., The University, Reading.
Stock, Leo F., M.A., Ph.D., LL.D., Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1017 Michigan Avenue, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
Stretton, Miss G., M.A., 8 Devonshire Gardens, W.4.

Summers, H. F., Market Place, Southwell, Notts.
SUMNER, B. H., M.A., Balliol College, Oxford.
Sumner, E. J., M.A., Sedgwick House, Sedbergh, Yorks.
Sumner, Rev. Percy, F.S.A., St. Luke's Vicarage, 14 Erleigh Road, Reading.
Sutherland, Miss L. S., M.A., Somerville College, Oxford.
Sweet, Professor A. H., A.M., Ph.D., Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa., U.S.A.
Sykes, Rev. Professor Norman, M.A., D.Phil., Westfield College, N.W.3.

* Tanner, Miss E. M., B.A., Roedean School, Brighton.
TANNER, L. E., M.V.O., M.A., F.S.A., 49 Romney Street, S.W.1.
Tapley-Soper, H., F.L.A., F.S.A., City Library, Castle Street, Exeter.
Tarn, W. W., Litt.D., F.B.A., Muirtown House, Inverness, Scotland.
Tate, W. E., Sneyd Church School, Nile Street, Burslem, Staffs.
Tawney, Professor R. H., B.A., Litt.D., F.B.A., 44 Mecklenburgh Square, W.C.1.
* Tayler, Miss H., 181 Queens Gate, S.W.7.
Taylor, A. J., B.A., 15 Cheyne Row, S.W.3.
Taylor, Professor Eva G. R., D.Sc., 34 Oakley Street, S.W.3.
Taylor, Rt. Rev. Abbot, F.L.A., M.C., M.A., St. Augustine's Abbey, Ramsgate.
* Temperley, Professor H. W. V., O.B.E., Litt.D., F.B.A., Peterhouse, Cambridge.
Thistlethwaite, B., 10 Victoria Road, Harborne, Birmingham.
Thomas, A. H., M.A., LL.D., F.S.A., Records Office, Guildhall, E.C.2.
Thompson, Miss A. D., 30 Bolam Street, S.W.11.
THOMPSON, Professor A. HAMILTON, C.B.E., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A., Beck Cottage, Adel, Leeds, 6.
Thompson, Miss B. M. Hamilton, M.A., B.Litt., St. Mary's College, Durham.
Thompson, Rev. J. M., M.A., Magdalen College, Oxford.
Thomson, Miss G. Scott, M.A., F.S.A., 23 Carlisle Mansions, Carlisle Place, S.W.1.
Thomson, M. A., M.A., D.Phil., 123 Gower Street, W.C.1.
Thomson, T. R. F., M.A., c/o Lloyds Bank, 39 Threadneedle Street, E.C.
Thornley, Miss I. D., M.A., 6 Cholmeley Crescent, N.6.
Thrupp, Miss S. L., M.A., Ph.D., 2626 13th Avenue, West, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
Tipping, C. H., B.A., Hotel Manchester, Cheltenham.
Todd, Professor J. E., M.A., Queen's University, Belfast.
* Todhunter, Sir Charles, K.C.S.I., Bangalore, India.
Tolhurst, J. B. L., F.S.A., 47 Manor Road, Beckenham, Kent.
Tomkeieff, Mrs. O. G., M.A., LL.B., King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 2.
Tompkins, H. W., 8 Cromer Road, Southend-on-Sea.
Tory, Henry Marshall, M.A., LL.D., D.Sc., 327 Buena Vista Road, Rockcliffe Park, Ottawa, Canada.
Tout, Mrs. T. F., M.A., 10 North Square, N.W.11.
Toye, D. B., O.B.E., LL.D., 32 Welbeck Avenue, Hove, Sussex.
Toynbee, Miss M. R., M.A., Ph.D., 22 Park Town, Oxford.
Toyne, S. M., M.A., Little Acres, Ware, Herts.
Treat, Professor P. J., Ph.D., 750 Dolores Street, Stanford University, Cal., U.S.A.

Treharne, Professor R. F., M.A., Ph.D., Hillside, Brynymor Road, Aberystwyth.
* Trevelyan, Professor G. M., O.M., Litt.D., F.B.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Trickett, A. S., A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Brother's College, Drew University, Madison, N.J., U.S.A.
Trotter, R. G., A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Queen's University, Kingston, Canada.
Tunstall, W. C. B., M.A., 34 Dartmouth Row, S.E.10.
Turberville, Professor A. S., M.C., M.A., B.Litt., 94 Potternewton Lane, Leeds.
Tweedsmuir, Lord, G.C.M.G., C.H., LL.D., D.C.L., Elsfield Manor, Oxford.
Tyler, J. E., M.A., The University, Sheffield.
Tyson, M., M.A., Ph.D., The Victoria University, Manchester.

*Usher, Professor R. G., Ph.D., Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., U.S.A.

Van der Byl, F. V., M.A., Ph.D., Litt.D., Rodney House, Cheltenham.
Vaucher, Professor Paul, D. ès L., Queen Anne's Mansions, S.W.1.
Veale, E. W. W., LL.D., 14 Orchard Street, Bristol.
Veitch, Professor G. S., M.A., Litt.D., 8 Brompton Avenue, Liverpool, 17.
* Vickers, Principal K. H., M.A., University College, Southampton.
Vincent, Professor J. M., Ph.D., 406 South Holliston Avenue, Pasadena, Cal., U.S.A.

* Wade, C. E., M.A., 39 Regent's Park Road, N.W.1.
* Wake, Miss Joan, Northamptonshire Record Society, County Hall, Northampton.
Wale, W., Cambridge Villas, 121 The Promenade, Cheltenham.
Walker, Professor E. A., M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge.
Walker, Major G. G., D.S.O., M.C., Armoury House, City Road, E.C.1.
Walker, J., M.A., Ph.D., Kelbrook, Greenrigg Gardens, Alexandra Road, Sunderland.
Walker, J. Holland, M.B.E., F.S.A., 15 Park Valley, Nottingham.
* Walker, J. W., O.B.E., F.S.A., Twemlow Hall, Holmes Chapel, Cheshire.
* Walker, Robert J., F.S.A., Ormidale, Knighton Park Road, Leicester.
Walker, W. H. T., M.A., New Street, Heckington, nr. Sleaford, Lincs.
* Wall, J. C., 108 Canterbury Road, E.10.
Wallace, Malcolm W., B.A., Ph.D., 91 Walmer Road, Toronto, Canada.
* Ward, Mrs. J. G. S., B.A., Ph.D., Unsted, Hartswood Road, Brentwood, Essex.
* Warmington, Professor E. H., M.A., 48 Flower Lane, N.W.7.
* Watt, James, LL.D., W.S., 7 Blackford Road, Edinburgh, 9.
* Watts, Rev. Herbert C., 27 Jaycroft, Burnham-on-Sea.
Weaver, F. J., M.A., Beechleys, Winkton Common, Christchurch, Hants.
* Webster, Professor C. K., M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A., 38 Mecklenburgh Square, W.C.1.
Wedgwood, Miss C. V., B.A., 23 Sheffield Terrace, W.8.
Weeks, Rev. G. E. A., M.A., B.D., LL.D., Fenny Compton Rectory, Leamington Spa.

Weiner, A., M.A., 23 Tudor Close, Belsize Park, N.W.3.
Weitzmann, Miss S., M.A., Ph.D., 15 Clissold Court, Green Lanes, N.4.
Welbourne, E., M.A., Emmanuel College, Cambridge.
Westergaard, Professor Waldemar, Ph.D., 1000 Manning Avenue, Los Angeles, Cal., U.S.A.
Whale, Miss G. B., B.A., 29 Park Place, Cardiff.
Wheeler, H. F. B., D.Litt. (Hon.), Balholmen, Grove Road, Northwood, Middlesex.
White, A. B., Ph.D., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., U.S.A.
* White, Miss E. M., Westcroft, Norton Road, Wembley, Middlesex.
White, G. H., 2 Dungarvan Avenue, S.W.15.
Whitehead, A. W., M.A., The Midland Bank, Hill Street, Jersey, Channel Islands.
Whiteley, J. G., 223 West Lanvale Street, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.
Whitelock, Miss D., M.A., St. Hilda's College, Oxford.
* Whitfield, Professor A. S., B.Litt., Dyffryn-on-Sea, Merioneth.
Whiting, Rev. Professor C. E., D.D., B.C.L., F.S.A., St. Chad's College, Durham.
* Whitley, Rev. W. T., LL.D., 18 New London Road, Chelmsford.
Whitney, Rev. Professor J. P., D.D., D.C.L., 6 St. Peter's Terrace, Cambridge.
Whyte, Rev. A. J. B., M.A., Litt.D., 26 Latimer Road, Headington, Oxford.
Wilkinson, Rev. J. T., M.A., B.D., Roseville, Knighton, Radnorshire.
Wilkinson, M., M.A., St. John's College, Oxford.
Williams, A. J., M.A., Church House, The Ridgeway, N.W.7.
Williams, the Very Rev. A. T. P., M.A., D.D., Christ Church, Oxford.
Williams, Professor A. F. B., M.A., F.B.A., 38c Holland Park, W.11.
Williams, Professor C. H., M.A., 50 North Hill, N.6.
Williams, H. G., M.A., High School for Boys, Westcliff-on-Sea.
Williams, Rev. James, 19 St. Margaret's Road, Oxford.
Williams, Miss Judith B., Ph.D., Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass., U.S.A.
Williams, Professor J. W., M.A., B.Litt., The Roundel, St. Andrews, Fife.
Williams, L. F. Rushbrook, C.B.E., M.A., B.Litt., Rye House, Silchester, near Reading.
Williams, T. G., M.A., 63 Eardley Crescent, S.W.5.
Williams, Rev. Watkin, M.A., Wentworth House, Great Malvern.
Williams, W. W., B.Sc., Sedgemead, Wroxham Drive, Upton, Wirral, Cheshire.
Williamson, Rev. C. C. H., St. Mary of the Angels, W.2.
Williamson, F., Museum and Art Gallery, Derby.
Willson, D. H., Ph.D., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., U.S.A.
Wilson, A. E., M.A., D.Litt., Terrington, Tivoli Crescent N., Brighton.
Wilson, H. W., D.Litt., 203 Elgin Avenue, W.9.
* Wilson, Rev. S. G., B.Litt., F.S.A.(Scot.), Blean Vicarage, Canterbury.
Winfield, Professor P. H., LL.D., F.B.A., 13 Cranmer Road, Cambridge.
Winstanley, D. A., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Wittke, Professor Carl, A.B., A.M., Ph.D., 278 West College Street, Oberlin, Ohio, U.S.A.
Wood, A. C., M.A., B.Litt., D.Phil., 21 Elm Avenue, Beeston, Nottingham.

Wood, Herbert, B.A., F.S.A., 74 Hazlewell Road, S.W.15.
Wood, Miss M., M.A., Ph.D., 13 Learmonth Gardens, Edinburgh, 4.
Wood, N., M.A., Ph.D., 55 London Road, Sleaford, Lincs.
Wood, William, Rock House, Polperro, Cornwall.
Woodbine, Professor G. E., B.A., Ph.D., LL.B., Guilford, Conn., U.S.A.
Woodhead, E. W., M.A., 39 Eaton Road, Norwich.
Wood-Legh, Miss K. L., B.Litt., Ph.D., 49 Owlstone Road, Cambridge.
Woods, E. C., L.D.S., R.C.S., Green Gables, Bowness-on-Windermere.
Woodward, E. Ll., M.A., All Souls College, Oxford.
Workman, Rev. H. B., D.D., D.Lit., Westminster College, Horseferry Road, S.W.1.
Wrong, Professor G. M., M.A., LL.D., 73 Walmer Road, Toronto, Canada.
Wynn, Rev. H. E., M.A., Pembroke College, Cambridge.

Yorke, Philip Chesney, M.A., L.-ès-L., 98 Addison Road, W.14.
Young, R. Fitzgibbon, M.A., D.Phil., Heath House, Oxshott, Surrey.

Zaleski, August, B.Sc., Bank Handlowy, Warsaw, Poland.

ASSOCIATES OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Beaumont, H., M.A., 85 Northampton Road, Wellingborough.
Beggs, Miss M. E., B.A., 18 Mecklenburgh Square, W.C.1.
Beloff, M., B.A., B.Litt., 12 Sollershott, Linkside Avenue, N. Oxford.
Bennett, R. F., B.A., 48 Hornchurch Road, Romford, Essex.
Blaydon, G. R., Guildhall, Thetford, Norfolk.
Borough, Rev. R. F., M.A., Bradbourne Vicarage, Ashbourne, Derbyshire.
Briers, Miss P. M., 51 Nottingham Place, W.1.
Brown, Miss M. M. M. Graham, M.A., 43 Poynder's Court, Poynder's Road, S.W.4.
Bruce, M., B.A., 13 While Road, Sutton Coldfield, Warwick.

Collar, H., The Museum, Saffron Walden, Essex.
Cook, E. T., 116 Westwood Park, S.E.23.
Crews, C. C., M.A., Highfield, The Flats, Blackwater, nr. Camberley, Hants.

Daniel, E. W., B.A., c/o Education Department, Port of Spain, Trinidad, B.W.I.

Elvin, L., 10 Almond Avenue, Swanpool, Lincoln.
Emsden, Nevil, 26 Sherborne Avenue, Norwood Green, Southall, Middx.

Garrett, Miss C. H., M.A., Bardwell Court, 15 Bardwell Road, Oxford.
Gregory, Miss A. L., M.A., Ph.D., Bradda, Frewland Avenue, Stockport.

Headlam, Mrs. Cecil, Broadmead, Charing, Kent.
Heriot, D. B., M.A., Ph.D., 21 Melrose Avenue, Rutherglen, Glasgow.

Inglis, D., M.A., County House, Brecon.

James, A. W., B.A., St. Swithin's House, Lewes.
Jarvis, R. C., 110 Framlingham Road, Brooklands, Sale, Cheshire.
Jones, E. W., 54 Walker Road, Blackley Estate, Manchester, 9.

Kelley, Miss L. W., M.A., 6 Campden House Mews, W.8.

Lea, R. S., M.A., 29 Crestway, S.W.15

Manton, J. O., Bourtonville, Buckingham.
Mathews, E. F. J., Eastlea, 56 Wimborne Road, Poole.
Melville, Miss M., M.A., 15 Upper Cheyne Row, S.W.3.
Mills, H. J., M.A., B.Sc., 15 Worbeck Road, S.E.20.
Mitchell, H. C., 31 Aldergate, Tamworth, Staffs.

Newman, F. H., Netley, Gaping Lane, Hitchin.
Nicholls, R. E., M.A., Ph.D., Glenholm, Hook Road, Surbiton, Surrey.

Otway-Ruthven, Miss A. J., B.A., Cloragh House, Ashford, Co. Wicklow.

Philip, I. G., M.A., 356 Woodstock Road, Oxford.
Philips, C. H., M.A., 19c Queen Parade Mansions, N.10.
Price, S. J., Westbury, Creswich Road, W.3.

Radford, Miss C., 2 Pennsylvania Park, Exeter.
Reeve, H. F., 24 Gold Top, Newport.
Riley, H. G., A.R.I.B.A., The White House, Foxton, Market Harborough.

Sanders, I. J., M.A., 51 Salisbury Road, Cardiff.
Scroggs, Miss E. S., 12 Vicarage Gate, W.8.
Slegg, W. B., The Cedars, Harling, Norwich.
Smith-Masters, Rev. J. E., M.A., Byeways, Andover Road, Newbury.

Thorne, S. A., M.A., LL.B., North Western University School of Law, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.

Waters, S. H., M.A., 5 Belmont Road, Wakefield.
Williams, E. T., B.A., Merton College, Oxford.

HONORARY FELLOWS.

Kenyon, Sir Frederic G., G.B.E., K.C.B., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A., F.S.A., Kirkstead, Godstone, Surrey.

* Lyte, Sir H. C. Maxwell, K.C.B., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A., 61 Warwick Square, S.W.1.

* Poole, Reginald L., LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A., 19 Banbury Road, Oxford.

CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

Almkvist, Professor Johan, Nybrogatan 7, Stockholm, Sweden.
Altamira y Crevea, Professor R., The Peace Palace, Permanent Court of International Justice, the Hague, Holland.
Andrews, Professor C. M., Ph.D., Litt.D., LL.D., Yale University, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.

Bémont, Charles, D.Litt., 14 Rue Monsieur le Prince, Paris (VI^{e}), France.
Birkenmajer, Professor Aleksander, Ph.D., Dept. of MSS., University Library, Cracow, Poland.
Botha, Graham C., M.A., Archive Department, Houses of Parliament, Cape Town, South Africa.
Brandt, Professor K., Dr.Phil., Litt.D., The University, Göttingen, Germany.

Cheyney, Emeritus Professor E.P., A.M., LL.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., U.S.A.
Colenbrander, Professor H. J., Dr.Phil., The University, Leiden, Holland.
Cuvelier, Dr. J., Archiviste General du Royaume, Avenue des Rogations, 45, Brussels, Belgium.

Delehaye, Père Hippolyte, D.Litt.(Oxon), Société des Bollandistes, Boulevard Saint Michel 24, Brussels, Belgium.
Dembinski, Professor Bronislaw, Dr.Phil., The University, Pozen, Poland.
Dopsch, Professor Alfons, Dr.Phil., The University, Vienna, Greater Germany.

Halecki, Professor Oskar, Dr.Phil., The University, Warsaw, Poland.
Handelsman, Professor Marceli, Ph.D., The University, Warsaw, Poland.
Hannay, Professor R. K., M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.E., 5 Royal Terrace, Edinburgh.
Hayden, Professor Mary T., M.A., 26 Cambridge Road, Upper Rathmines, Dublin.

* Honorary Life Fellows under By-law IV. (since repealed).

Holtzmann, Professor R., Ph.D., Am Schlachtensee 145, Berlin-Nikolassee, Germany.
Horváth, Professor E., Phil.D., II, Ilona útca 4, Francis Joseph Institute, Budapest, Hungary.
Huizinga, Professor J., Ph.D., The University, Leiden, Holland.

Iorga, N., Ph.D., Chaussée Bonaparte 6, Bucharest, Roumania.

Kehr, Professor Paul F., Dr.Phil., Kaiser Wilhelms Institut, Charlottenstrasse 41, Berlin N.W.7, Germany.
Koht, Professor H., Dr.Phil., Litt.D., The University, Oslo, Norway.

Leland, W. G., A.M., Litt.D., 907 15th Street, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
Linvald, Professor Axel, Keeper of the Archives, Norgesmindevej 20 Copenhagen, Hellerup, Denmark.
Lloyd, Professor Sir John, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A., Gwaen Deg, Bangor, Wales.
Lot, Professor F., D.-ès-L., Faculté des Lettres, The University, Paris, France.

McIlwain, Professor C. H., Ph.D., LL.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Meinecke, Professor Friedrich, Dr. Phil et Jur., The University, Berlin, Germany.
Meyer, Professor A. O., Ph.D., Wilhelmstrasse 14, Berlin-Lichterfelde-Ost, Germany.
Michael, Emeritus Professor Wolfgang, Ph.D., Hon. LL.D.(Edinburgh), Maria Theresiastrasse 3, Freiburg (Breisgau), Germany.

Nabholz, Professor Hans, Dr.Phil., D.-ès-L., The University, Zürich, Switzerland.

Pagès, Professor Georges, Faculté des Lettres, The University, Paris, France.
Petit-Dutaillis, Charles, D.-ès-L., Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Paris, France.
Pribram, Professor A. F., D.Phil., The University, Vienna, Greater Germany.

Ravenell, H. E., A.B., A.M., 430 East Main Street, Spartanburg, South Carolina, U.S.A.
Re, Emilio, Cav. Dr., Archivio di Stato, Rome, Italy.

Sarkar, Sir Jadunath, C.I.E., M.A., Sarkar-abas, Darjiling, Bengal, India.
Sarolea, Prof. Charles, K.O.L., LL.D., Litt.D., 21 Royal Terrace, Edinburgh,
Srbik, Professor Heinrich Ritter von, Dr.Phil., The University, Vienna. Greater Germany.
Susta, Professor Josef, Dr. Phil., Charles University, Prague, Czecho-Slovakia.

Uriburu, Señor J. E., Basavilbaso 1254, Buenos Aires, Argentine, South America.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBING LIBRARIES—1937-38

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

Aberdeen University.
Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales.
University College of Wales.

Bangor, University College of North Wales.
Bath, Municipal Library.
Belfast, The Queen's University.
Birkenhead Public Library.
Birmingham Library, Margaret Street.
Public Libraries (Reference Library).
University.
Bolton Central Reference Library, Town Hall Square.
Bradford Public Library, Darley Street.
Brighton Public Library, Royal Pavilion.
Bristol Central Library.
University.

Cambridge, Girton College.
King's College.
Newnham College.
Peterhouse.
St. Catharine's College.
St. John's College.
The Seeley Historical Library, The Old Schools.
University Library.
Canterbury, Dean and Chapter Library.
Cardiff Public Library.
Carlisle Public Library, Castle Street.
Cork, University College.
Coventry, Gulson (Central) Library.

Downside Abbey, *see* Stratton-on-the-Fosse.
Dublin, King's Inns Library.
National Library of Ireland, Kildare Street.
Royal Irish Academy, 19 Dawson Street.
Trinity College.
Durham University.

Edinburgh, Signet Library.
National Library of Scotland.
Public Library.
University Library.
Englefield Green, Surrey, Royal Holloway College.
Exeter, University College.

Glasgow, Baillie's Institution, 153 West Regent Street.
Faculty of Procurators Library, 68 St. George's Place.
Mitchell Library.
University Library.
Gloucester Public Library, Brunswick Road.
Grimsby Public Library.

Hawarden, St. Deiniol's Library.
Hove Public Library.
Hull, University College.

Leeds Library, Commercial Street, Leeds.
Public Library.
The University.
Leicester Municipal Library, Wellington Street.
Lincoln, The County Library, Newland.
Liverpool, Athenæum, Church Alley.
Public Library.
University.
London, The Admiralty Library, S.W.1.
The Athenæum Club, Pall Mall, S.W.1.
Battersea Public Libraries, Lavender Hill, S.W.11.
Bedford College for Women, Regent's Park, N.W.1.
Birkbeck College, Bream's Buildings, Chancery Lane, W.C.2.
British Museum, W.C.1.
Chelsea Public Library, Manresa Road, S.W.3.
Chiswick Public Library, Duke's Avenue, W.4.
Conservative Club, St. James's Street, S.W.1.
Finsbury Public Library, Skinner Street, E.C.1.
Fulham Public Library, 598 Fulham Road, S.W.6.
Gray's Inn Library, W.C.1.
Guildhall Library, King Street, E.C.2.
Hampstead Central Public Library, Finchley Road, N.W.8.
Hendon Public Library, The Burroughs, N.W.4.
House of Commons Library, S.W.1.
House of Lords Library, S.W.1.
Inner Temple Library, E.C.4.
Institute of Historical Research, University of London, Bloomsbury, W.C.1.
Kensington Public Library, High Street, W.8.
King's College Library, Strand, W.C.2.
Law Society Library, Chancery Lane, W.C.2.
Leyton Public Library, High Road, E.10.
Lincoln's Inn Library, W.C.2.
London Library, St. James's Square, S.W.1.
London School of Economics and Political Science, Houghton Street, Aldwych, W.C.2.
London University, Bloomsbury, W.C.1.
Middle Temple Library, E.C.4.
National Portrait Gallery, S.W.1.
New University Club, St. James's Street, S.W.1.
The Oratory, Brompton Road, S.W.7

London, Oxford and Cambridge Club, 71 Pall Mall, S.W.1.
Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, W.C.2.
Reform Club, 104 Pall Mall, S.W.1.
Royal Empire Society, Northumberland Avenue, W.C.2.
Royal Holloway College, *see* Englefield Green.
Royal Institution, 21 Albemarle Street, W.1.
Royal Societies Club, 63 St. James's Street, S.W.1.
St. George's Public Library, Buckingham Palace Road, S.W.1
Sion College Library, Victoria Embankment, S.W.1.
Southwark Central Library, Walworth Road, S.E.17.
Stoke Newington Public Library, Church Street, N.16.
United University Club, 1 Suffolk Street, S.W.1.
University College Library, Gower Street, W.C.1.
Westfield College Library, Hampstead, N.W.3.
Dr. Williams's Library, 14 Gordon Square, W.C.1.

Manchester, The John Rylands Library.
Public Libraries.
Middlesbrough Free Library, Municipal Buildings.
Mirfield, House of the Resurrection.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Literary and Philosophical Society.
Public Library.
Newport (Mon.), Public Library.
Norfolk and Norwich Library, Guildhall Hill, Norwich.
Nottingham Public Reference Library.
University College.

Oldham, Union Street Library.
Oxford, All Souls College.
Balliol College.
Bodleian Library.
Exeter College.
Jesus College.
Keble College.
Magdalen College.
Manchester College.
Merton College.
Oriel College.
St. John's College.
Somerville College.
The Queen's College.
Union Society.

Plymouth, The Athenæum, George Street.
Preston Library (Dr. Shepherd's).

Reading Free Public Library, Blagrave Street.

St. Andrews University.
Sheffield Public Library.
University.
Southampton, University College.
Stafford, William Salt Public Library.
Stonyhurst College, Whalley, Lancs.

Stratton-on-the-Fosse, near Bath, Downside Abbey.
Swansea University College, Singleton Park.

Wigan Public Library.
Wimbledon Public Library, S.W.19.
Windsor, Royal Library, Windsor Castle.
Workington Public Library.

York Public Library.
Yorkshire Architectural and Archæological Society, c/o Rev. Angelo Raine, Dringhouses, York.

BRITISH DOMINIONS AND INDIA.

Adelaide (South Australia), Public Library.
University Library.
Allahabad (India), University Library.
Auckland (New Zealand), University Library.

Bombay (India), University Library.
Brisbane (Australia), Public Library of Queensland Library.
University of Queensland Library.
Bulawayo, Rhodesia (South Africa), Public Library.

Canberra (Australia), Library of the Parliament of the Commonwealth.
Cape Town (South Africa), South African Library.
Colombo (Ceylon), University College Library.

Dunedin (New Zealand), Otago University Library.

Grahamstown (South Africa), Rhodes University College Library.

Halifax (Nova Scotia), Legislative Library.

Johannesburg (South Africa), Public Library.

Lahore (India), University of the Punjab Library.
London (Canada), University of Western Ontario Library.
Lucknow (India), Lucknow University College Library.

Melbourne (Australia), University Central Library.
Public Library.
Montreal (Canada), Civic Library, 1210 Sherbrooke Street E.
McGill University Library, 3459 McTavish Street.

Ottawa (Canada), Library of Parliament.

Perth (West Australia), Public Library.
Pretoria (South Africa), State Library.

Sydney (Australia), Public Library, Parliament Buildings.
University Library.

Toronto (Canada), Legislative Library of Ontario, Parliament Buildings.
Public Library, College and St. George Street.

Valletta (Malta), The Royal Malta Library.
Victoria (British Columbia, Canada), Provincial Library.

Wellington (New Zealand), General Assembly Library.
Victoria University Library.

FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

BELGIUM.

Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale.
Gand, Bibliothèque de l'Université, 2 Fosse d'Othon.

CHINA.

Peiping, The National Library (Periodical Division), Kunming, Yunnan.

CZECHO-SLOVAKIA.

Prague, University Library.

DENMARK.

Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliothek.

FRANCE.

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale.
Institut de France.
Université de Paris.
Strasbourg, Bibliothèque Nationale et Universitaire, 6 Place de la République.

GERMANY.

Berlin, Preussische Staats-Bibliothek.
Bonn, Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Freiburg i. Br., Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Göttingen, Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Greifswald, Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Halle, Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Hamburg, Freien und Hansestadt Bibliothek.
Heidelberg, Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Jena, Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Leipzig, Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Marburg, Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Münich, Bayer Staats-Bibliothek.
Würzburg, Universitäts-Bibliothek.

ITALY.

Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.

NORWAY.

Oslo, The University Library.

POLAND.

Warsaw, Biblioteka Ministerstwo Spraw Zagranicznych.

SWEDEN.

Göteborg, Stads Bibliotek.
Lund, K. Universitetets-Bibliotek.
Stockholm, Kungl. Bibliotek.
Uppsala, K. Universitetets-Bibliotek.

SWITZERLAND.

Basel, Universitäts Bibliothek, Schonbeinstrasse, 20.

UNITED STATES.

Albany (N.Y.), New York State Library.
Amherst (Mass.), Amherst College Library.
Ann Arbor (Mich.), Michigan University Library.
Austin (Texas), Texas University Library.

Baltimore (Md.), Enoch Pratt Library.
Johns Hopkins University Library.
Peabody Institute Library.
Berkeley (Cal.), California University Library.
Bethlehem (Pa.), Lehigh University Library.
Bloomington (Ind.), Indiana University Library.
Boston (Mass.), Athenæum Library.
Public Library.
Brunswick (Me.), Bowdoin College Library.
Bryn Mawr (Pa.), Bryn Mawr College Library.
Buffalo (N.Y.), Grosvenor Public Library.

Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard University Library.
Harvard Law School Library.
Chapel Hill (N.C.), University of North Carolina Library.
Charlottesville (Va.), University of Virginia Library.
Chicago (Ill.), Newberry Library.
University Library (Order Section W. 21).
Cincinnati (Ohio), Public Library.
University Library.
Cleveland (Ohio), Public Library, 325 Superior Avenue, N.E.
Clinton (N.Y.), Hamilton College Library.
Columbus (Ohio), State University Library.

Detroit (Mich.), Public Library.
Durham (N.C.), Duke University Library.

Eugene (Oregon), University of Oregon Library.
Evanston (Ill.), North Western University Library.

Fordham (N.Y.), Fordham University Library.

Grand Rapids (Mass.), Public Library.

Hanover (N.H.), Dartmouth College Library.
Haverford (Pa.), Haverford College Library.
Houston (Texas), Rice Institute Library.

Ithaca (N.Y.), Cornell University Library.

Jersey City (N.J.), Free Public Library, 472–486 Jersey Avenue.

Lawrence (Kans.), Kansas University Library.
Lincoln (Neb.), Nebraska University Library.
Los Angeles (Cal.), Public Library, 35 South Hope Street.
University of California Library, 405 Hilgard Avenue.

Madison (Wis.), State Historical Society of Wisconsin Library.
Milwaukee (Wis.), Public Library.
Minneapolis (Minn.), Athenæum Library.
Minnesota University Library.
Mundelein (Ill.), Feehan Memorial Library, St. Mary of the Lake Seminary.

Nashville (Tenn.), Vanderbilt University Library.
Newark (N.J.), Free Public Library, 5 Washington Street.
New Haven (Conn.), Yale University Library.
New Orleans (La.), Tulane University Library.
New York (N.Y.), Columbia University Library.
General Theological Seminary Library, 175 Ninth Avenue.
Public Library.
University, Washington Square Library, 32 Waverley Place.
Northampton (Mass.), Smith College Library.

Orono (Me.), University of Maine Library.

Philadelphia (Pa.), Historical Society of Pennsylvania Library, 1300 Locust Street.
Library Company of Philadelphia.
Pennsylvania University Library.
St. Clement's Library, Locust Street at Forty Second.
Pittsburg (Pa.), Carnegie Library (The Periodical Room), 4400 Forbes Street.
Poughkeepsie (N.Y.), Vassar College Library.
Princeton (N.J.), Princeton University Library.
Providence (R.I.), Brown University Library.

Richmond (Va.), Virginia State Library.
Rochester (N.Y.), The Rush Rees Library, University of Rochester.

St. Louis (Mo.), Public Library.
University Library, Grand and Pine Boulevards.
Washington University Library.
San Francisco (Cal.), Public Library, Civic Center.
San Marino (Cal.), Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery.
Seattle (D.C.), University of Washington Library.
South Hadley (Mass.), Mount Holyoke College Library.
Stanford (Cal.), University Library.

Terre Haute (Ind.), Indiana State Normal School Library.

Urbana (Ill.), Illinois University Library.

Washington (D.C.), Catholic University of America Library.
Wellesley (Mass.), Wellesley College Library.
Williamstown (Mass.), Williams College Library.
Winona (Minn.), College of Saint Teresa Library.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

WHICH EXCHANGED TRANSACTIONS WITH THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY, 1937–38.

Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House, London, W.1.
Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland, 63 Merrion Square, Dublin.
Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, Queen Street, Edinburgh.
The Hon. Society of Cymmrodorion, 20 Bedford Square, W.C.1.
Surrey Archæological Society, Castle Arch, Guildford.
Jewish Historical Society, Mocatta Library, University College, Gower Street, W.C.1.
The University, Manchester.
Thoroton Society, Bromley House, Angel Row, Nottingham.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES ABROAD

WHICH EXCHANGE TRANSACTIONS WITH THE SOCIETY

AUSTRALIA.

Royal Australian Historical Society, Department of Education Offices, Bridge Street, Sydney.

BELGIUM.

Académie Royale de Belgique, Commission Royale d'Histoire, Palais des Academies, Rue Ducale, 1, Brussels.
Archives, Hotel de Ville, Antwerp.

CANADA.

Nova Scotia Historical Society, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa.
Toronto University.

FRANCE.

Bibliothèque de l'Université de Toulouse, 2 Rue de l'Université, Toulouse Haute-Garonne.
Société de l'École Nationale des Chartes, 19 Rue de la Sorbonne, Paris.
Société de l'Histoire de France, 60 Rue des Francs-Bourgeois, Paris.

GERMANY

Deutsch-Ausländische Buchtausch, Unter der Linden, 38, Berlin, N.W.7.
Hansischer Geschichtsverein, Staats Archiv, Königstrasse 21, Lübeck.

HOLLAND.

Commissie van Advies voor Rijks Geschied-kundige Publicatien, The Hague.
Historisch Genootschap, Utrecht.

POLAND.

Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Varsovie, L'Université, Warsaw.

SPAIN.

Real Academia de la Historia, Calle del Leon 21, Madrid.

SWITZERLAND.

Allgemeine Geschichtsforschende Gesellschaft der Schweiz. Stadt Bibliothek, Berne.

UNITED STATES.

American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Mass.
American Jewish Historical Society, 3080 Broadway, New York.
Connecticut Historical Society, Hartford, Conn.
Illinois Historical Society, Springfield, Illinois.
Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
Maine Historical Society, Portland, Maine, U.S.A.
Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, Md.
Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, Mass.
New England Historic-Genealogical Society, 9 Ashburton Place, Boston, Mass.
New Jersey Historical Society, 16 West Park Street, Newark, N.J.
New Hampshire State Library, Concord, N.H.
New York Historical Society, 77 Street and Central Park West, New York.
Virginia Historical Society, 707 East Franklin Street, Richmond, Va.

The Council are not responsible for the accuracy of the foregoing list, but they request that any inaccuracy or omission may be pointed out to the Secretary, and that all changes of address may be notified to him, so that delay in forwarding communications and the Publications of the Society may be avoided.

TRANSACTIONS AND PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

The annual publications of the Society issued to Fellows and Subscribing Libraries include the *Transactions* supplemented since 1897 by a continuation of the publications of the Camden Society (1838–1897) as the *Camden series*, and since 1937 by a series of *Guides and handbooks*. The Society has also issued from time to time certain miscellaneous publications, has published since 1937 an annual bibliography of *Writings on British history*, and is publishing in conjunction with the American Historical Association a series of *Bibliographies of British history*. Additional copies of the *Transactions*, the *Camden series*, the *Guides and handbooks*, and the " Miscellaneous publications " may be obtained by Fellows and Subscribing Libraries at the prices stated below. The series of annual bibliographies of *Writings on British history* and the *Bibliographies of British history* are not included among the volumes issued to subscribers, but may be obtained by them through the Society, at the special prices stated below, upon application to the Assistant Secretary, Royal Historical Society, 96 Cheyne Walk, S.W.10. Associates, while receiving only the *Transactions* in return for their subscription, are entitled to purchase at a reduction of 25 per cent one copy of other volumes issued to Fellows and Subscribing Libraries and one copy of each of the volumes of the *Writings on British history* and the *Bibliography of British history* at the special price.

The *Transactions* and the *Camden series* are not available on sale to the public. Copies of the " Miscellaneous publications " may be had at the stated prices on application to the Assistant Secretary. The *Guides and handbooks*, the *Writings*, and the *Bibliographies of British history* may be obtained from the publishers or through the booksellers.

TRANSACTIONS.*

Old series, 1872–1882. Vols. I to X.
New series, 1884–1906. Vols. I to XX.
Third series, 1907–1917. Vols. I to XI.
Fourth series, 1918–1937. Vols. I to XX.

* Vols. 1, 2, 3 and 9 of the Old series are out of print. Old series, vols. 4, 5, 7, 10, and Third series, vol. 9, are only supplied by special leave of the Council. Others are supplied at the following rates: current number, 15s.; volumes of the New, Third, and Fourth series, 10s. each; volumes of the Old series, 7s. 6d. each. The earliest volumes of the *Transactions* were issued to Fellows in unbound parts. Any discrepancies in the lettering of bound volumes during these periods are doubtless due to this.

MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS.

Domesday commemoration. Notes on the manuscripts, etc., exhibited at the Public Record Office. 1886. 5s.

Domesday studies. 2 vols. Edited by P. E. Dove. 1886. 24s.

England and Napoleon in 1803 : being the despatches of Lord Whitworth and others. Edited by Oscar Browning. 1887. 7s. 6d.

Walter of Henley's Husbandry, together with an anonymous Husbandry, Seneschaucie, and Robert Grosseteste's Rules. Edited by Elizabeth Lamond and the Rev. W. Cunningham. 1890. 12s.

Proceedings of the Gibbon commemoration, 1794–1894. 1895. 5s.

The Domesday of Inclosures, 1517–18. Edited by I. S. Leadam. 2 vols. 1897. 30s.

A bibliography of the historical works of Mandell Creighton, William Stubbs, S. R. Gardiner and John, Lord Acton. Edited by W. A. Shaw. 1903. 5s.

German opinion and German policy before the War. By G. W. Prothero. 1914. 4s.

Magna Carta commemoration essays. With preface by the Right Hon. Viscount Bryce. Edited by H. E. Malden. 1917. 25s.

A repertory of British archives. Part I. England. Compiled by Hubert Hall. 1920. 10s. 6d.

A list and index of the Transactions and Publications of the Royal Historical Society (1869–1924) and of the Publications of the Camden Society (1840–1897). Edited by Hubert Hall. 1925. 5s.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES ISSUED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

Bibliography of British history : Tudor period, 1485–1603. Edited by Conyers Read. 1933. Oxford Univ. Press, 30s. (Special price, 20s. 9d.)

Bibliography of British history : Stuart period, 1603–1714. Edited by Godfrey Davies. 1928. Oxford Univ. Press, 21s. (Special price, 16s. 6d.)

Bibliography of British History : 1715–1789. Edited by D. J. Medley and S. M. Pargellis. (*In preparation.*)

ANNUAL BIBLIOGRAPHIES.

Writings on British history, 1934. Compiled by A. T. Milne. 1937. London, Jonathan Cape, 12s. 6d. (Special price, 10s.)

Writings on British history, 1935. Compiled by A. T. Milne. 1939. London, Jonathan Cape, 12s. 6d. (Special price, 10s.)

GUIDES AND HANDBOOKS.

1. Guide to English commercial statistics, 1696–1782. By G. N. Clark, with a catalogue of materials by Barbara M. Franks. 1938. 7s. 6d.

Approved for future publication :

Handbook of British chronology. Edited by F. M. Powicke.

Guide to the historical literature relating to British portraits. By S. H. Steinberg.

Handbook of British currency. Edited by A. E. Feavearyear.

List and index of parliamentary papers, 1700–1800. Edited by E. Wagstaff and A. T. Milne.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LATE CAMDEN SOCIETY, CONTINUED (FROM 1897) AS THE CAMDEN SERIES OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.†

OLD SERIES.

*1. Historie of the arrivall of Edward IV in England and the final recoverye of his kingdomes from Henry VI (1471). Edited by J. Bruce. 1838.

*2. Kynge Johan. A play in two parts. By John Bale. Edited by J. P. Collier. 1838.

*3. Alliterative poem on the deposition of Richard II ; Ricardi Maydiston de Concordia inter Ric. II et civitatem London. Edited by T. Wright. 1838.

*4. Plumpton correspondence. Letters written in the reigns of Edward IV, Richard III, Henry VII, and Henry VIII. Edited by T. Stapleton. 1839.

*5. Anecdotes and traditions, illustrative of early English history and literature. Edited by W. J. Thoms. 1839.

*6. The political songs of England, from the reign of John to Edward II. Edited and translated by T. Wright. 1839.

*7. Annals of the first four years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, by Sir J. Hayward. Edited by J. Bruce. 1840.

8. Ecclesiastical documents : 1. A brief history of the bishoprick of Somerset from its foundation to 1174. 2. Charters from the library of Dr. Cox Macro. Published by the Rev. J. Hunter. 1840.

*9. Speculi Britanniæ Pars : an historical and geographical description of the county of Essex, by John Norden, 1594. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 1840.

*10. A Chronicle of the first thirteen years of the reign of Edward IV, by John Warkworth, D.D. Edited by J. O. Halliwell. 1839.

*11. Kemp's nine daies wonder : performed in a daunce from London to Norwich. Edited by Rev. A. Dyce. 1840.

*12. The Egerton papers, temp. Elizabeth and James I. Edited by J. P. Collier. 1840.

† Of volumes marked with an asterisk but a few copies remain, and these are only supplied by special leave of the Council. Others may be had at the following prices : Old series, from 6s. ; New series, from 7s. 6d. ; Third series, from 10s. (*British diplomatic instructions*, 17s. 6d. each) ; current volumes, 15s. each.

13. Chronica Jocelini de Brakelonda, de rebus gestis Samsonis abbatis monasterii Sancti Edmundi. Edited by J. G. Rokewode. 1840. (*Out of print.*)

*14. Narratives illustrative of the contests in Ireland in 1641 and 1690. Edited by T. C. Croker. 1841.

*15. The chronicle of William de Rishanger, of the Barons' Wars. The miracles of Simon de Montfort. Edited by J. O. Halliwell. 1840.

16. The Latin poems commonly attributed to Walter Mapes. Edited by T. Wright. 1841. (*Out of print.*)

17. The second book of the travels of Nicander Nucius, of Corcyra. Edited by Rev. J. A. Cramer. 1841.

18. Three early English metrical romances. Edited by J. Robson. 1842.

19. The private diary of Dr. John Dee, and the catalogue of his library of manuscripts. Edited by J. O. Halliwell. 1842.

*20. An apology for Lollard doctrines, attributed to Wicliffe. Edited by J. H. Todd. 1842.

21. Rutland papers. Original documents illustrative of the courts and times of Henry VII and Henry VIII. Edited by W. Jerdan. 1842.

22. The diary of Dr. Thomas Cartwright, bishop of Chester, from August 1686 to October 1687. Edited by the Rev. J. Hunter. 1843.

23. Original letters of eminent literary men of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 1843.

24. A contemporary narrative of the proceedings against Dame Alice Kyteler, prosecuted for sorcery in 1324, by Richard de Ledrede, bishop of Ossory. Edited by T. Wright. 1843.

*25. Promptorium parvulorum sive clericorum, Lexicon anglo-latinum princeps, auctore fratre Galfrido Grammatico dicto, e Predicatoribus Lenne Episcopi, Northfolciensi, A.D. *c.* 1440. Vol. I. Edited by A. Way. 1843. (*See* nos. 54 and 89.)

*26. Three chapters of letters relating to the suppression of monasteries. Edited by T. Wright. 1843.

27. Correspondence of Robert Dudley, earl of Leycester, during his government of the Low Countries 1585 and 1586. Edited by J. Bruce. 1844.

28. Croniques de London, depuis l'an 44 Hen. III jusqu'à l'an 17 Edw. III. Edited by G. J. Aungier. 1844.

29. Three books of Polydore Vergil's English history, comprising the reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV and Richard III. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 1844. (*See* no. 36.)

30. The Thornton romances. The early English metrical romances of Perceval, Isumbras, Eglamour, and Degrevant. Edited by J. O. Halliwell. 1844.

31. Verney papers. Notes of proceedings in the Long Parliament, temp. Charles I. Edited by J. Bruce. 1845.

32. The autobiography of Sir John Bramston, K.B., of Skreens, in the hundred of Chelmsford. 1845.

33. Letters from James, earl of Perth, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, etc., to his sister the countess of Erroll, and other members of his family. Edited by W. Jerdan. 1845.

34. De antiquis legibus liber. Cronica maiorum et vicecomitum Londoniarum, 1178–1274. By T. Stapleton. 1846.

35. The chronicle of Calais, in the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII, to 1540. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1846.

36. Polydore Vergil's English history, prior to the Norman Conquest. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 1846. (*See* no. 29.)

37. A relation, or rather a true account, of the isle of England, about 1500. Translated from the Italian by Charlotte Augusta Sneyd. 1847.

38. Documents relative to the foundation and antiquities of the collegiate church of Middleham, co. York, and incidental notices of the castle, neighbourhood and town. Edited by Rev. W. Atthill. 1847.

39. The Camden miscellany, Vol. I: 1. Register and chronicle of the abbey of Aberconway. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 2. Chronicle of the rebellion in Lincolnshire in 1470. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 3. Bull of Pope Innocent VIII, on the marriage of Henry VII with Elizabeth of York. Communicated by J. P. Collier. 4. Journal of the siege of Rouen in 1591. By Sir T. Coningsby. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 5. Letter from George Fleetwood to his father, giving an account of the battle of Lutzen and the death of Gustavus Adolphus. Edited by Sir P. de Malpas Grey Egerton, Bart. 6. Diary of Dr. Edward Lake, archdeacon and prebendary of Exeter, etc., in 1677 and 1678. Edited by G. P. Elliott. 1847.

40. A commentary of the services and charges of William Lord Grey of Wilton, by his son Arthur Lord Grey of Wilton. Edited by Sir P. de Malpas Grey Egerton, Bart. 1847.

41. Diary of Walter Yonge, Justice of the Peace, and M.P. for Honiton, 1604 to 1628. Edited by G. Roberts. 1848.

42. The Diary of Henry Machyn, citizen and Merchant Taylor of London, from 1550 to 1563. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1848.

43. The visitation of the county of Huntingdon under the authority of William Camden, Clarenceux King of Arms, by his deputy Nicholas Charles, Lancaster Herald, 1613. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 1849.

44. The obituary of Richard Smyth, secondary of the poultry Compter, London, 1627 to 1674. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 1849.

45. Certaine considerations upon the government of England. By Sir Roger Twysden. Edited by J. M. Kemble. 1849.

46. Letters of Queen Elizabeth and James VI of Scotland. Edited by J. Bruce. 1849.

47. Chronicon Petroburgense. Edited by T. Stapleton. 1849.

48. The chronicle of Queen Jane, and of two years of Queen Mary and especially of the rebellion of Sir Thomas Wyat. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1850.

49. Wills and inventories, from the registers of the commissary of Bury St. Edmunds and the archdeacon of Sudbury. Edited by S. Tymms. 1850.

50. Gualteri Mapes de nugis curialium distinctiones quinque. Edited by T. Wright. 1850.

51. The pylgrymage of Sir Richard Guylforde to the Holy Land, 1506. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 1851.

52. Moneys received and paid for secret services of Charles II and James II, 1679 to 1688. Edited by J. Y. Akerman. 1851.

53. Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1852. (*Out of print.*)

54. Promptorium parvulorum, Vol. II. Edited by A. Way. 1853. (*See* nos. 25 and 89.)

55. The Camden miscellany, Vol. II: 1. Account of the expenses of John of Brabant and Henry and Thomas of Lancaster, 1292–3. Edited by J. Burtt. 2. Household expenses of the Princess Elizabeth at Hatfield, 1551–2. Edited by Viscount Strangford. 3. The request and suite of a true-hearted Englishman written by William Cholmeley, Londyner, in 1553. Edited by W. J. Thoms. 4. The discovery of the Jesuits' College at Clerkenwell in March, 1627–8, and a letter found in their house. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 5. Trelawny papers. Edited by W. D. Cooper. 6. Autobiography and anecdotes, by William Taswell. Edited by G. P. Elliott. 1853. (*Out of print.*)

56. Letters and papers of the Verney family, to the end of 1639. Edited by J. Bruce. 1853. (*Out of print.*)

57. The Ancren Riwle. A treatise on the rules and duties of monastic life. Edited by J. Morton. 1853. (*Out of print.*)

58. Letters of the Lady Brilliana Harley. Edited by T. T. Lewis. 1853.

59. A roll of the household expenses of Richard de Swinfield, bishop of Hereford, 1289–90. Vol. I. Edited by the Rev. J. Webb. 1853. (*See* no. 62.) (*Out of print.*)

60. Grants, etc., from the Crown during the reign of Edward V and two speeches for opening parliament, by John Russell, bishop of Lincoln, Lord Chancellor. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1854.

61. The Camden miscellany, Vol. III: 1. Papers relating to proceedings in co. Kent, 1642–1646. Edited by R. Almack. 2. Ancient biographical poems, on the duke of Norfolk, Viscount Hereford, the earls of Essex, and Queen Elizabeth. Edited by J. P. Collier. 3. A relation of some abuses which are committed against the Commonwealth, 1629. Edited by Sir F. Madden. 4. Inventories of the wardrobes, plate, chapel stuff, etc., of Henry FitzRoy, duke of Richmond, and of Katherine, Princess Dowager. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1855.

62. A roll of the household expenses of Richard de Swinfield, bishop of Hereford. Vol. II. Edited by the Rev. J. Webb. 1855. (*See* no. 59.)

63. Charles I in 1646 : Letters of Charles I to Queen Henrietta Maria. Edited by J. Bruce. 1856.

64. An English chronicle of the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI written before 1471. Edited by the Rev. J. S. Davies. 1856.

65. The Knights Hospitallers in England, 1338. Edited by the Rev. L. B. Larking. 1857.

66. Diary of John Rous, incumbent of Santon Downham, Suffolk, from 1625 to 1642. Edited by Mary Anne E. Green. 1856.

67. Trevelyan papers prior to 1558. Part I. Edited by J. P. Collier. 1857. (*See* nos. 84 and 105.)

68. Journal of the Very Rev. Rowland Davies, dean of Ross 1688–1690. Edited by R. Caulfield. 1857.

69. The Domesday of St. Paul's, 1222 ; or Registrum de visitatione maneriorum per Robertum decanum, and other original documents relating to the manors and churches belonging to the dean and chapter of St. Paul's London in the 12th and 13th centuries. Edited by W. H. Hale. 1858.

70. Liber famelicus of James Whitelocke, a judge of the King's Bench in the reigns of James I and Charles I. Edited by J. Bruce. 1858.

71. Savile correspondence, temp. Charles II and James II. Edited by W. D. Cooper. 1858.

72. The Romance of Blonde of Oxford and Jehan of Dammartin. By Philippe de Reimes, a trouvère of the thirteenth century. Edited by A. J. V. Le Roux de Lincy. 1858.

73. The Camden miscellany, Vol. IV : 1. A London chronicle during the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII. Edited by C. Hopper. 2. The expenses of the Judges of Assize riding in the western and Oxford circuits, 1596–1601. Edited by W. D. Cooper. 3. The skryvener's play, the incredulity of St. Thomas. Edited by J. P. Collier. 4. The Childe of Bristowe, a poem by John Lydgate. Edited by C. Hopper. 5. Sir Edward Lake's account of his interviews with Charles I on being created a baronet. Edited by T. P. Langmead. 6. The letters of Pope to Atterbury, when in the Tower of London. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 7. Supplementary note to the discovery of the Jesuits' College at Clerkenwell in March 1627–8. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1859.

74. Diary of the marches of the royal army during the great Civil War, kept by Richard Symonds. Edited by C. E. Long. 1859.

75. Original papers illustrative of the life and writings of John Milton. Edited by W. D. Hamilton. 1859.

76. Letters of George Lord Carew to Sir Thomas Roe, ambassador to the court of the Great Mogul, 1615–1617. Edited by J. Maclean. 1860.

77. Narratives of the days of the Reformation chiefly from the MSS. of John Foxe, the martyrologist; with two contemporary biographies of Archbishop Cranmer. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1859.

78. Correspondence of James VI of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and others in England, temp. Elizabeth. Edited by J. Bruce. 1861.

79. Letters written by John Chamberlain during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by Sarah Williams. 1861.

80. Proceedings, principally in co. Kent, in connection with the Parliaments called in 1640. Edited by Rev. L. B. Larking. 1862.

81. Parliamentary debates in 1610. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1862.

*82. Lists of foreign protestants, and aliens, resident in England, 1618–1688. Edited by W. D. Cooper. 1862.

83. Wills from Doctors' Commons. A selection from the wills of eminent persons proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury. 1495–1695. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1863.

84. Trevelyan papers. Part II. 1446–1643. Edited by J. P. Collier. 1863. (*See* nos. 67 and 105.)

85. The life of Marmaduke Rawdon of York. Edited by R. Davies. 1863.

86. Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou and Bishop Beckington, and others, temp. Henry V and Henry VI. Edited by C. Munro. 1863.

87. The Camden miscellany, Vol. V: 1. Five letters of Charles II. Communicated by the marquis of Bristol. 2. Letter of the Council to Sir Thomas Lake, relating to the proceedings of Sir Edward Coke at Oatlands. 3. Documents relating to Sir Walter Raleigh's last voyage. Communicated by S. R. Gardiner. 4. A catalogue of early English miscellanies formerly in the Harleian Library. Edited by W. C. Hazlitt. 5. Letters selected from the collection of autographs in the possession of William Tite, Esq. 6. Sir Francis Drake's memorable service done against the Spaniards in 1587, written by Robert Leng, one of his co-adventurers. Edited by C. Hopper. 7. Inquiry into the genuineness of a letter dated February 3rd, 1613, signed "Mary Magdaline Davers." 1864. (*Out of print.*)

88. Letters from Sir Robert Cecil to Sir George Carew. Edited by J. Maclean. 1864.

89. Promptorium parvulorum. Vol. III. Edited by A. Way. 1865. (*See* nos. 25 and 54.) (*Out of print.*)

90. Letters and other documents illustrating the relations between England and Germany at the commencement of the Thirty Years' War. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1865. (*See* no. 98.)

91. Registrum sive liber irrotularius et consuetudinarius prioratus Beatae Mariae Wigorniensis. Edited by W. H. Hale. 1865.

92. Pope Alexander VII and the college of Cardinals. By John Bargrave, canon of Canterbury [1662–1680] with a catalogue of Dr. Bargrave's Museum. Edited by J. C. Robertson. 1867.

*93. Accounts and papers relating to Mary, queen of Scots. Edited by A. J. Crosby and J. Bruce. 1867.

94. History from marble. Compiled in the reign of Charles II by Thomas Dingley. Printed in photolithography by Vincent Brooks. Vol. I. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1867. (*See* no. 97.) (*Out of print.*)

95. Manipulus vocabulorum. A dictionary of English and Latin words by Peter Levins, 1570. First printed 1570. Re-edited by H. B. Wheatley. 1867.

96. Journal of a voyage into the Mediterranean, by Sir Kenelm Digby, 1628. Edited by J. Bruce. 1868.

97. History from marble. Vol. II. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1868. (*See* no. 94.) (*Out of print.*)

98. Letters and other documents illustrating the relations between England and Germany at the commencement of the Thirty Years' War, from the election of the Emperor Ferdinand II to the close of the conferences of Mühlhausen. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1868. (*See* no. 90.)

99. Diary of John Manningham, of the Middle Temple and of Bradbourne, Kent, barrister-at-law, 1602–3. Edited by W. Tite. 1868.

100. Notes of the treaty carried on at Ripon between Charles I and the Covenanters of Scotland, 1640, taken by Sir John Borough, Garter King of Arms. Edited by J. Bruce. 1869.

101. El hecho de los tratados del matrimonio pretendido por el Principe de Gales con la serenissima Infante de España Maria, tomado desde sus principios para major demostracion de la verdad, y ajustado con los papeles originales desde consta. Por el maestro F. Francisco de Jesus. Narrative of the Spanish marriage treaty. Edited and translated by S. R. Gardiner. 1869.

102. Churchwardens' accounts of the town of Ludlow, in Shropshire, from 1540 to the end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by T. Wright. 1869.

103. Notes of the debates in the House of Lords, officially taken by Henry Elsing, Clerk of the Parliaments, 1621. Edited by S. R. Gardiner.

104. The Camden miscellany, Vol. VI: 1. Life of William Whittingham, dean of Durham, with an appendix of original documents from the Record Office. Edited by Mary Anne E. Greene. 2. The Earl of Bristol's defence of his negotiations in Spain. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. Journal of Sir Francis Walsingham, December 1570 to April 1583. Edited by C. T. Martin. 1870.

105. Trevelyan papers. Part III, 1446–1643. Edited by Sir Walter and Sir Charles Trevelyan. 1872. (*See* nos. 67 and 84.)

NEW SERIES.

Vol. 56 onwards were issued after the amalgamation of the two Societies.

1. The Fortescue papers; chiefly consisting of letters relating to state affairs, collected by John Packer, secretary to George Villiers, duke of Buckingham. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1871.

*2. Letters and papers of John Shillingford, mayor of Exeter, 1447–50. Edited by Stuart A. Moore. 1871.

3. The old cheque book of the Chapel Royal from 1561 to 1744. Edited by E. F. Rimbault. 1872. (*Out of print.*)

4. A true relation of the life and death of the Right Rev. William Bedell, lord bishop of Kilmore in Ireland. Edited by T. W. Jones. 1872.

5. The maire of bristowe is kalendar, by Robert Ricart, town clerk of Bristol, 18 Edward IV. Edited by Lucy Toulmin Smith. 1872. (*Out of print.*)

6. Debates in the House of Commons in 1625. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1873.

7. Military memoir of Colonel Birch, governor of Hereford during the Civil War; written by Roe, his secretary. Edited by the Rev. John Webb and the Rev. T. W. Webb. 1873.

8 and 9. Letters addressed from London to Sir Joseph Williamson while plenipotentiary at the congress of Cologne in the years 1673 and 1674. Edited by W. D. Christie. 1874. Two vols.

10. Account of the executors of Richard, bishop of London, 1303, and of the executors of Thomas, bishop of Exeter, 1310. Edited by the Venerable W. H. Hale, and the Rev. H. T. Ellacombe. 1874.

11. A chronicle of England during the reigns of the Tudors, from 1485 to 1559, by Charles Wriothesley, Windsor Herald. Edited by W. D. Hamilton. Vol. I. 1875. (*See* no. 20.)

12. The quarrel between the earl of Manchester and Oliver Cromwell; An episode of the English Civil War. Historical preface by J. Bruce. Annotated and completed by D. Masson. 1875.

13. Autobiography of Anne, Lady Halket. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 1875.

14. The Camden miscellany, Vol. VII: 1. Two sermons preached by the Boy-Bishop, one at St. Paul's, temp. Henry VIII, the other at Gloucester, temp. Mary. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 2. Speech of Sir Robert Heath, Attorney-General, in the case of Alexander Leighton in the Star Chamber, 4 June 1630. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 3. Notes of Sir G. Croke's judgment in the case of Ship Money. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 4. Letters relating to the mission of Sir Thomas Roe to Gustavus Adolphus, 1629–1630. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 5. Receipts and expenses in building Bodmin church, 1469–1472. Edited by the Rev. J. J. Wilkinson. 1875.

15. Letters of Humphrey Prideaux, dean of Norwich, to John Ellis, Under Secretary of State 1674–1722. Edited by E. Maunde Thompson. 1875.

*16. A common place book of John Milton, and a Latin essay and Latin verses presumed to be by Milton. Edited by A. J. Horwood. 1876.

17. Historical collections of a London citizen in the fifteenth century, containing (i) John Page's poem on the siege of Rouen, (ii) Lydgate's verses on the king of England, (iii) William Gregory's chronicle of London. Edited by James Gairdner. 1876.

*18. Documents relating to the proceedings against William Prynne. Biographical preface by J. Bruce. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1877.

19. Christ Church letters relating to the priory of Christ Church, Canterbury. Edited by J. B. Sheppard. 1877.

20. Wriothesley's chronicle. Vol. II. Edited by W. D. Hamilton. 1878. (*See* no. 11.)

21. A treatise of the pretended divorce between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon, by Nicholas Harpsfield, archdeacon of Canterbury. Edited by N. Pocock. 1878.

22. Correspondence of the family of Hatton, 1601–1704. Vol. I. Edited by E. Maunde Thompson. 1878. (*See* no. 23.)

23. Correspondence of the family of Hatton, 1601–1704. Vol. II. Edited by E. Maunde Thompson. 1878. (*See* no. 22.)

24. Notes of the debates in the House of Lords officially taken by Henry Elsing, Clerk of the Parliaments, 1624 and 1626. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1879. (*See* Third Series, no. 42.)

25. The Œconomy of the Fleete: or an apologeticall answeare of Alexander Harris (late warden) unto XIX articles sett forth against him by the prisoners. Edited by the Rev. Augustus Jessopp. 1879.

26. Documents relating to St. Paul's Cathedral. Edited by the Rev. W. Sparrow Simpson. 1880.

27. The Hamilton papers; selections from original letters in the possession of the duke of Hamilton and Brandon, 1638–1648. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1880.

28. Three fifteenth-century chronicles, with historical memoranda and contemporary notes of occurrences by John Stowe. Edited by James Gairdner. 1880. (*Out of print.*)

29. The registers of the visitors of the university of Oxford, 1647 to 1658. Edited by Montagu Burrows. 1881.

30. Catholicon anglicum, an English-Latin wordbook, dated 1483. Edited by Sidney J. H. Herrtage. 1872.

31. The Camden miscellany, Vol. VIII: 1. Four letters of Lord Wentworth, earl of Strafford, with a poem on his illness. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 2. Memoire by Madame de Motteville on the life of Henrietta Maria. Edited by G. Hanotaux. 3. Papers relating to the delinquency of Lord Saville, 1642–1646. Edited by J. J. Cartwright. 4. A secret negotiation with Charles I, 1643–1644. Edited by Bertha M. Gardiner. 5. A letter from the earl of Manchester to the House of Lords, giving an opinion on the conduct of Oliver Cromwell. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 6. Letters addressed

to the earl of Lauderdale. Edited by O. Airy. 7. Original letters of the duke of Monmouth, in the Bodleian Library. Edited by Sir George Duckett, Bart. 8. Correspondence of the family of Haddock, 1657–1719. Edited by E. Maunde Thompson. 9. Letters of Richard Thompson to Henry Thompson of Escrick, co. York. Edited by J. J. Cartwright. 1883.

32. The voyage to Cadiz in 1625, being a journal written by John Glanville, secretary to the Lord Admiral of the fleet. Edited by the Rev. A. B. Grosart. 1883.

33. Letter book of Gabriel Harvey, 1573–1580. Edited by Edward J. L. Scott. 1884.

34. The Lauderdale papers, temp. Car. II. Vol. I. 1639–1667. Edited by O. Airy. 1884. (*See* nos. 36 and 38.)

35. Political memoranda of Francis, fifth duke of Leeds. Edited by Oscar Browning. 1884.

36. The Lauderdale papers. Vol. II. 1667–73. Edited by O. Airy. 1885. (*See* nos. 34 and 38.)

37. Troubles connected with the Prayer Book of 1540. Edited by N. Pocock. 1884.

38. The Lauderdale papers. Vol. III. 1673–79. Edited by O. Airy. 1885. (*See* nos. 34 and 36.)

39. Reports of cases in the courts of Star Chamber and High Commission. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1886.

40. The Nicholas papers: Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State. Vol. I. 1641–1652. Edited by G. F. Warner. 1886. (*See* nos. 50, 57, and Third Series, No. 31.)

41. Custumals of Battle Abbey, 1283–1312. Edited by S. R. Scargill Bird. 1887.

42. The travels through England of Dr. Richard Pococke, successively Bishop of Meath and Ossory during 1750, 1751 and later years. Edited by J. J. Cartwright. Vol. I. 1888. (*See* no. 44.)

43. Visitations of the diocese of Norwich, 1492–1532. Edited by the Rev. Augustus Jessopp. 1888.

44. The travels through England of Bishop Pococke. Vol. II. Edited by J. J. Cartwright. 1889. (*See* no. 42.)

45. Documents relating to the impeachment of the duke of Buckingham in 1626. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1889.

46. Memoirs relating to Lord Torrington. Edited by J. K. Laughton. 1889.

47. Essex Papers. Vol. I. Edited by O. Airy. 1890. (*See* Third series, no. 24.)

48. Visitations and memorials of Southwell Minster. Edited by A. F. Leach. 1891.

49. The Clarke papers. Selections from the papers of William Clarke, 1647–1660. Vol. I. Edited by C. H. Firth. 1891. (*See* nos. 54, 61 and 62.) (*Out of print.*)

50. The Nicholas papers. Vol. II. Jan. 1653–June 1655. Edited by G. F. Warner. 1892. (*See* nos. 40, 57, and Third series, no. 31.)

51. Accounts of the obedientiars of Abingdon Abbey. Edited by R. E. G. Kirk. 1892.

52. Expeditions to Prussia and the Holy Land made by Henry, earl of Derby (afterwards Henry IV) : Accounts kept by his treasurer during the years 1390–1 and 1392–3. Edited by Lucy Toulmin Smith. 1894.

53. The Camden miscellany, Vol. IX : 1. Visitations of churches belonging to St. Paul's Cathedral, 1249–1252. Edited by the Rev. W. Sparrow Simpson. 2. " The Spousells " of the Princess Mary, daughter of Henry VII, to Charles, prince of Castile, in 1508. Edited by J. Gairdner. 3. Original letters from the bishops to the Privy Council in 1564. Edited by Mary Bateson. 4. Papers relating to Thomas Wentworth, first earl of Strafford. Edited by C. H. Firth. 5. Hamilton papers, Addenda. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 6. Memoirs of Nathaniel, Lord Crewe. Edited by the Rev. Andrew Clark. 7. The journal of Major Richard Ferrier, M.P., during a tour in France in 1687. Edited by R. F. E. and J. A. H. Ferrier. 1895. (*Out of print.*)

54. The Clarke Papers. Vol. II. Edited by C. H. Firth. 1894. (*Out of print.*) (*See* nos. 49, 61 and 62.)

55. Visitations of churches belonging to St. Paul's Cathedral in 1297 and in 1485. Edited by W. Sparrow Simpson. 1895. (*Out of print.*)

56. The Archpriest controversy. Documents relating to the dissensions of the Roman Catholic clergy, 1597–1602. Vol. I. Edited by T. G. Law. 1896. (*See* no. 58.)

57. The Nicholas papers. Vol. III. July 1655–Dec. 1656. Edited by G. F. Warner. 1897. (*See* nos. 40 and 50, and Third Series, no. 31.)

58. The Archpriest controversy. Vol. II. Edited by T. G. Law. 1898. (*See* no. 56.)

59. A narrative of the changes in the ministry told by the duke of Newcastle in a series of letters to John White, M.P. 1765–1767. Edited by Mary Bateson. 1898.

60. The narrative of General Venables, with an appendix of papers relating to the Jamaica expedition, 1655. Edited by C. H. Firth. 1900.

61. The Clarke Papers. Vol. III. Edited by C. H. Firth. 1899. (*See* nos. 49, 54 and 62.)

62. The Clarke Papers. Vol. IV. Edited by C. H. Firth. 1901. (*See* nos. 49, 54 and 61.)

THIRD SERIES.

1. The Cely papers : Correspondence and memoranda of the Cely family, merchants of the Staple in London and Calais, 1477–1488. Edited by H. E. Malden. 1900.

2. The despatches and correspondence of John, earl of Buckinghamshire, Ambassador to the court of Catherine II of Russia. 1762–1765. Edited by Adelaide d'Arcy Collyer. Vol. I. 1900. (*See* no. 3.)

3. The earl of Buckinghamshire's correspondence. Vol. II. Edited by Adelaide d'Arcy Collyer. 1902. (*See* no. 2.)

4. The Camden miscellany, Vol. X: 1. The journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham, Solicitor-General in Ireland and Master of Requests, 1593–1616, together with notes in another hand, 1642–1644. Edited by H. Spencer Scott. 2. The travels and life of Sir Philip Hoby, of Bisham Abbey, written by himself, 1547–1564. Edited by Edgar Powell. 3. Prince Rupert at Lisbon. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 1902.

5. The despatches of William Perwich, English agent in Paris, 1669–1677. Edited by M. Beryl Curran. 1903.

6. Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia. Vol. I. Edited by the Right Rev. F. A. Gasquet. 1904. (*See* nos. 10 and 12.)

7. Select despatches relating to the formation of the Third Coalition against France, 1804–1805. Edited by J. H. Rose. 1904.

8. The Presbyterian movement in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, as illustrated by the minute book of the Dedham classis, 1582–1589. Edited by R. G. Usher. 1905.

9. State trials of 1289–1290. Edited by T. F. Tout and Hilda Johnstone. 1906.

10. Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia. Vol. II. Edited by the Right Rev. F. A. Gasquet. 1906. (*See* nos. 6 and 12.)

11. The acts & ordinances of the Eastland Company preserved at York. Edited by Maud Sellers. 1906.

12. Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia. Vol. III. Edited by the Right Rev. F. A. Gasquet. 1906. (*See* nos. 6 and 10.)

13. The Camden miscellany, Vol. XI: 1. Some unpublished letters of Gilbert Burnet, the historian. Edited by Miss Helen C. Foxcroft. 2. Extracts from the papers of Thomas Woodcock, ob. 1695. Edited by G. C. Moore Smith. 3. The memoirs of Sir George Courthop, 1616–1685. Edited by Sophie C. Lomas. 4. The commonwealth charter of the city of Salisbury, [12] September, 1656. Edited by Hubert Hall, 1907.

14. The relation of Sydnam Poyntz, 1624–1636. Edited by the Rev. A. T. S. Goodrick. 1908.

15. The diary of the Rev. Ralph Josselin, 1616–1683. Edited by E. Hockliffe. 1908.

16. Despatches from Paris, 1784–1789. Vol. I, 1784–1787. Edited by Oscar Browning. 1909. (*See* no. 19.)

17. The Bardon Papers: Documents relating to the imprisonment and trial of Mary, Queen of Scots. Edited by Conyers Read. 1909.

18. The Camden miscellany, Vol. XII: 1. Two London chronicles from the collection of John Stow. Edited by C. L. Kingsford. 2. Life of Sir John Digby, 1605–1645. Edited by Georges Bernard. 3. Iter bellicosum: Adam Wheeler, his account of 1685. Edited by H. E. Malden. 4. Common rights at Cottenham and Stretham in Cambridgeshire. Edited by W. Cunningham. 1910.

19. Despatches from Paris, 1784–1789. Vol. II, 1787–1789. Edited by Oscar Browning. 1910. (*See* no. 16.)

20. John of Gaunt's register, 1372–1376. Vol. I. Edited by S. Armitage-Smith. 1911. (*See* nos. 21, 56 and 57.)

21. John of Gaunt's register, 1372–1376. Vol. II. Edited by S. Armitage-Smith. 1911. (*See* nos. 20, 56 and 57.)

22. The official diary of Lieutenant-General Adam Williamson, Deputy-Lieutenant of the Tower of London, 1722–1747. Edited by J. C. Fox. 1912.

23. English merchants and the Spanish Inquisition in the Canaries. Edited by Leonora de Alberti and Annie B. Wallis Chapman. 1912.

24. The Essex papers, 1675–1677. Vol. II. Edited by the Rev. Clement E. Pike. 1913. (*See* New series, no. 47.)

25. The chronicle of Novgorod, 1016–1471. Translated and edited by R. Mitchell, N. Forbes and C. R. Beazley. 1914.

26. The official papers of Sir Nathaniel Bacon of Stiffkey, Norfolk, as Justice of the Peace, 1580–1620. Edited by W. H. Saunders. 1915. (*See* no. 52.)

27. Estate book of Henry de Bray of Harleston, Northants., *c.* 1289–1340. Edited by Dorothy Willis. 1916.

28. Autobiography of Thomas Raymond and memoirs of the family of Guise of Elmore, Glos. Edited by G. Davies. 1917.

29. The Stonor letters and papers, 1290–1483. Vol. I. Edited by C. L. Kingsford. 1919. (*Out of print.*) (*See* nos. 30 and 34.)

30. The Stonor letters and papers, 1290–1483. Vol. II. Edited by C. L. Kingsford. 1919. (*Out of print.*) (*See* nos. 29 and 34.)

31. The Nicholas papers. Vol. IV. 1657–1660. Edited by Sir G. F. Warner. 1920. (*See* New series, nos. 40, 50, 57.)

32. British diplomatic instructions, 1689–1789. Vol. I. Sweden, Part I, 1689–1727. Edited by J. F. Chance. 1922.

33. Parliamentary papers of John Robinson, 1774–1784. Edited by W. T. Laprade. 1922.

34. The Camden miscellany, Vol. XIII: 1. Gesta Dunelmensia, A.D. M°CCC°. Edited by R. K. Richardson. 2. Supplementary Stonor letters and papers, 1314–1482. Edited by C. L. Kingsford. 3. Devereux papers with Richard Broughton's memoranda (1575–1601). Edited by H. E. Malden. 4. The voyages of Captain William Jackson, 1642–1645. Edited by V. T. Harlow. 5. The English conquest of Jamaica, 1655–1656. Edited by Irene A. Wright. 1924.

35. British diplomatic instructions, 1689–1789. Vol. II. France, Part i, 1689–1721. Edited by L. G. Wickham Legg. 1925.

36. British diplomatic instructions, 1689–1789. Vol. III. Denmark. Edited by J. F. Chance. 1926.

37. The Camden miscellany, Vol. XIV : 1. Plan of St. Domingo. Spanish narrative of Santo Domingo. Translated and edited by Irene A. Wright. 2. Embajada Española ; An anonymous contemporary Spanish guide to diplomatic procedure in the last quarter of the 17th c. Translated and edited by the Rev. H. J. Chaytor. 3. The will of Peter de Aqua Blanca, Bishop of Hereford, 1268. Edited by the Rev. Canon C. Eveleigh Woodruff. 4. The ransom of John II, king of France, 1360–1370. Edited by Dorothy M. Broome. 5. Historia mirabilis parliamenti, 1386. Edited by May McKisack. 1926.

38. British diplomatic instructions, 1689–1789. Vol. IV. France, Part ii, 1721–1727. Edited by L. G. Wickham Legg. 1927. (*See* nos. 35, 43 and 49.)

39. British diplomatic instructions, 1689–1789. Vol. V. Sweden, Part ii, 1727–1789. Edited by J. F. Chance. 1928. (*See* no. 32.)

40. The *Vita Wulfstani* of William of Malmesbury. Edited by R. R. Darlington. 1928.

41. The Camden miscellany, Vol. XV : 1. A transcript of " The Red Book " of the bishopric of Hereford, *c.* 1290. Edited by the Rev. Canon A. T. Bannister. 2. Edward II, the Lords Ordainers, and Piers Gaveston's jewels and horses, 1312–1313. Edited by R. A. Roberts. 3. Table of Canterbury archbishopric charters. Edited by Irene J. Churchill. 4. An early admiralty case, A.D. 1361. Edited by Charles Johnson. 5. Select tracts and table books relating to English weights and measures, 1100–1742. Edited by Hubert Hall and Frieda J. Nicholas. 6. An English prisoner in Paris during the Terror, 1793–1794. Edited by V. T. Harlow. 1929.

42. Notes of the debates in the House of Lords, officially taken by Robert Bowyer and Henry Elsing, Clerks of the Parliaments, 1621, 1625, 1628. Edited by Frances W. Relf. 1929. (*See* New Series, no. 24.)

43. British diplomatic instructions, 1689–1789. Vol. VI. France, Part iii, 1727–1744. Edited by L. G. Wickham Legg. 1930. (*See* nos. 35, 38 and 49.)

44. Private correspondence of Chesterfield and Newcastle, 1744–1746. Edited by Sir Richard Lodge. 1930.

45. Documents illustrating the activities of the general and provincial chapters of the English Black Monks, 1215–1540. Vol. I. Edited by W. A. Pantin. 1931. (*See* nos. 47 and 54.)

46. British diplomatic representatives, 1689–1789. Edited by D. B. Horn. 1932. (*See* no. 50.)

47. Documents illustrating the activities of the general and provincial chapters of the English Black Monks, 1215–1540. Vol. II. Edited by W. A. Pantin. 1933. (*See* nos. 45 and 54.)

48. Diplomatic correspondence of Richard II. Edited by Edouard Perroy. 1933.

49. British diplomatic instructions, 1689–1789. Vol. VII. France, Part iv, 1745–1789. Edited by L. G. Wickham Legg. 1934. (*See* nos. 35, 38 and 43.)

50. British diplomatic representatives, 1789–1852. Edited by S. T. Bindoff, Elizabeth F. Malcolm Smith and C. K. Webster. 1934. (*See* no. 46.)

51. Rotuli parliamentorum Anglie hactenus inediti, 1279–1373. Edited by H. G. Richardson and G. O. Sayles. 1935.

52. Camden miscellany, Vol. XVI: 1. The state of England (1600). By Sir Thomas Wilson. Edited by F. J. Fisher. 2. Discours of the Turkes. By Sir Thomas Sherley (1606–1607). Edited by Sir E. Denison Ross. 3. Relation of a short survey of the western counties of England, 1635. Edited by L. G. Wickham Legg. 4. Supplementary Stiffkey papers, 1578–1620. Edited by F. W. Brooks. 5. Probate inventory of Sir John Eliot, late prisoner in the Tower, 1633. Edited by H. Hulme. 1936. (*See* no. 26.)

53. Robert Loder's farm accounts, 1610–1620. Edited by G. E. Fussell. 1936.

54. Documents illustrating the activities of the general and provincial chapters of the English Black Monks, 1215–1540. Vol. III. Edited by W. A. Pantin. 1937. (*See* nos. 45 and 47.)

55. Memorials of the Holles family, 1493–1650, by Gervase Holles. Edited by A. C. Wood. 1937.

56. John of Gaunt's register 1379–1383. Vol. I. Edited by the late Eleanor Lodge and R. Somerville. 1937. (*See* nos. 20, 21 and 57.)

57. John of Gaunt's register, 1379–1383. Vol. II. Edited by the late Eleanor Lodge and R. Somerville. 1937. (*See* nos. 20, 21 and 56.)

58. Early charters of the cathedral church of St. Paul, London. Edited by Marion Gibbs. (*In the press.*)

59. The formation of Canning's ministry, February to August 1827. Edited by A. Aspinall. 1938.

60. The correspondence of Lord Aberdeen and Princess Lieven, 1832–1854. Vol. I, 1832–1848. Edited by E. Jones Parry. 1938.

Approved for publication for the session 1938–39 :

The letters of Arnulf of Lisieux. Edited by F. Barlow.

The correspondence of Lord Aberdeen and Princess Lieven, 1832–1854. Vol. II, 1848–1854. Edited by E. Jones Parry.

Approved for future publication :

Camden miscellany, Vol. XVII.

British reports on trade and politics in Latin America, 1824–1827. Edited by R. A. Humphreys.

Domesday monachorum of Christ Church, Canterbury. Edited by D. C. Douglas.

British diplomatic representatives, 1509–1688. Edited by R. B. Wernham. (*See* nos. 46 and 50.)

The chronicle of Walter of Hemingburgh. Edited by H. Rothwell.

Proceedings under the *Dictum de Kenilworth*. Edited by F. M. Powicke and M. Tyson.

Ministers' accounts of the earldom of Cornwall, 1296–1297. Edited by Margaret Midgley.

Historia Roffensis, 1315–1350. Edited by H. G. Richardson.

Documents illustrating episcopal and abbatial elections. Edited by W. K. Evers.

Liber Eliensis, books I and II. Edited by Dorothy Whitelock.

The order of publication for volumes in the press or in preparation is provisional.

BIBL. LONDIN. UNIV.

SHL
WITHDRAWN

B - 5 OCT 1965